

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Vol. VI. No. 4

1955

CONTENTS

ARIE RUBINSTEIN

THE THEOLOGICAL ASPECT OF SOME VARIANT READINGS
IN THE ISAIAH SCROLL

R. J. ZWI WERBLOWSKY

A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF *SEDER ELIYAHU*

GEORGES VAJDA

THE MYSTICAL DOCTRINE OF RABBI 'OBADYAH, GRANDSON
OF MOSES MAIMONIDES

THE LATE DR. BRUNO ITALIENER

WHICH IS THE OLDEST WOODCUT HAGGADAH?

J. MAITLIS

LONDON YIDDISH LETTERS OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH
CENTURY (II)

A.A., C. RABIN, HELEN ROSENAU

CURRENT LITERATURE

5s. 6d. net
(\$0.90)
per copy

Published Quarterly

21s. net
(\$3.50)
per annum

BY

JEWISH CHRONICLE PUBLICATIONS

in association with

THE SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY & THE INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES

לתורה ולתעודה

SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY

Hillel House, 1 Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1. Telephone: EUSton 8843

Trustees :

THE RT. HON. LORD COHEN, P.C. ; SIR BASIL HENRIQUES ; LEONARD G. MONTEFIORE ; THE MARQUESS OF READING ; RABBI HAROLD F. REINHART ; ANTHONY DE ROTHSCHILD ; MRS. MEYER SASSOON ; LEONARD STEIN.

Officers :

President and Principal : RABBI DR. LEO BAECK.

Chairman : DR. E. J. COHN. *Treasurer* : DR. O. K. RABINOWICZ.

Hon. Secretary : HUGH HARRIS.

Objects :

The Society was founded in 1947 and its objects include the following:
To encourage and co-ordinate academic research in Jewish subjects: (a) by establishing a library of wide application; (b) by commissioning scholars to research in Jewish subjects, and providing them with all such moral and practical assistance as may be possible; (c) by publishing or arranging for publication of approved works on Jewish subjects.

To establish a centre of higher Jewish learning for the general promotion of Jewish knowledge and study; (a) by providing the machinery and curriculum usual and necessary for the foundation and conduct of an academic institution; (b) by providing suitable courses of lectures and supervision in Jewish study and research; (c) by providing general lectures in Jewish subjects of wide appeal; (d) by providing periodicals and other publications.

Activities :

PUBLIC LECTURES are regularly held at Hillel House. They are given by distinguished figures in the world of Jewish learning, and the texts of same are from time to time reproduced in *The Journal of Jewish Studies*.

SEMINAR. The Monday morning Seminar is an important and distinctive feature of the Society's activities. For half the year Dr. Baeck lectures on Jewish History and Philosophy. During the remaining half of the year the Seminar is led by scholars representing varied fields of Jewish learning.

COURSES OF STUDY are arranged in Bible Exegesis, Talmud, Codes, Jewish Philosophy, and other subjects.

THE LIBRARY consists of about 6,500 volumes of Hebraica, Judaica, and related subjects.

Membership :

Annual Membership Subscription is £1 1s. 0d. New members will be most cordially welcomed. All communications should be addressed to: *The Secretary, Society for Jewish Study, Hillel House, 1, Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1.*

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

*

ADVISORY BOARD :

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. M. Ginsberg. Prof. C. Singer.
Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

EDITORIAL BOARD :

Chairman : Rabbi A. Altmann, M.A., D.Phil.

D. Diringer, M.A., D.Litt. Professor Bernard Lewis, B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S.
E. Marmorstein, M.A. C. Rabin, M.A., D.Phil. S. Stein, Ph.D. R. J. Z.
Werblowsky, B.A., D.ès L. N. Wieder, Ph.D.

Vol. VI. No. 4

1955

CONTENTS

ARIE RUBINSTEIN

- THE THEOLOGICAL ASPECT OF SOME VARIANT READINGS IN THE
ISAIAH SCROLL 187

R. J. ZWI WERBLOWSKY

- A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF SEDER ELIYAHU 201

GEORGES VAJDA

- THE MYSTICAL DOCTRINE OF RABBI 'OBADYAH, GRANDSON OF
MOSES MAIMONIDES 213

THE LATE DR. BRUNO ITALIENER

- WHICH IS THE OLDEST WOODCUT HAGGADAH ? 227

J. MAITLIS

- LONDON YIDDISH LETTERS OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (II) 237
A.A., C. RABIN, HELEN ROSENAU
CURRENT LITERATURE 253

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES, MANCHESTER

"Stenecourt," Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs.

Telephone : Broughton 4027

Founded in 1953, the Institute is dedicated to the pursuit of scholarly research in the main branches of Jewish learning, including Biblical, Talmudic, and midrashic literature, Jewish philosophy and mysticism, Hasidism and modern Jewish thought. Under the hon. direction of Rabbi Dr. A. Altmann, it comprises a staff of academic experts who are engaged in both research and teaching. "Associates" drawn from prominent Hebrew scholars of various British universities participate in the research programme of the Institute, and attend its seminars for the discussion of their work.

The Institute admits post-graduates as research students, and provides tutorials in the various fields of Jewish studies for them and other advanced students.

The results of the researches undertaken are published in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* and other learned periodicals. Major works are scheduled to appear in a Series of Institute Publications.

It is part of the Institute's programme to provide facilities for co-operation between scholars working in the various fields of Jewish studies in the United Kingdom, and to this arranges conferences from time to time.

The Institute also endeavours to promote a deeper understanding of Judaism in the wider circles of the community and arranges study groups, courses, and extra-mural lectures for university students and others interested.

The programme of the Institute is worked out in consultation with an Academic Advisory Board whose members include Professors C. Rabin (Jerusalem), D. Daube (Oxford), B. Lewis (London), G. Vajda (Paris), J. Weingreen (Dublin), J. M. Yoffey (Bristol), and Dr. D. Diringer (Cambridge).

A limited number of bursaries is available to research students. Applications are to be addressed to the Hon. Director.

The Institute is recognised as a charitable Trust by the Inland Revenue, and contributions can be covenanted. The Governing Body of the Institute comprises prominent Jewish laymen from Manchester and London.

The Prospectus of the Institute is obtainable from the Secretary.

THE THEOLOGICAL ASPECT OF SOME VARIANT READINGS IN THE ISAIAH SCROLL*

The nature of the variant readings in the Isaiah Scroll¹ is not such as would justify the view that the theology proper of the Scroll differs materially from that of the Book of Isaiah in the MT. The adjective "theological" as used in the present paper must therefore be understood in a more limited sense, as denoting certain religious susceptibilities which can reasonably be inferred from the variant readings selected for discussion. These readings, whether original or not, are without exception meaningful and therefore not improbably deliberate. The present paper attempts to elucidate their meaning and to make their possible purpose explicit. This is ventured with the proviso that in the nature of the case the argument cannot be based on data which are wholly objective and that a measure of the speculative is unavoidable. What can be claimed, however, is that the readings admit of the interpretation given of them and are consistent with their suggested purpose. Where considerations exist to warrant the conclusion that a Scroll reading is not original, it will probably reflect some purpose extraneous to the prophecy of Isaiah as transmitted by Jewish tradition. On the other hand, such a purpose may well be present even where there is little to choose between the Scroll reading and the corresponding reading in the MT. In so far as anything is assumed at all in this paper, it is (a) that a textual variant must be taken to have some purpose, unless the reading is patently meaningless or can otherwise be shown to be an error, and (b) that the foregoing assumption applies to minimal variations no less than to the more extensive ones. It must be admitted, however, that the minimal variations raise a difficult problem, namely, that of the relationship, if any, between what appear to be stylistic modifications and their exegetical significance. This applies especially to the additional prepositions and conjunctions found in the Scroll. Some of these are undoubtedly mere stylistic simplifications, as, for example, the *lamedh* preposition

* Paper read at the Institute of Jewish Studies on December 5, 1955.

¹ *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Vol. I, ed. by MILLAR BURROWS, etc., New Haven, 1950—hereinafter referred to as "the Scroll." The Scroll orthography is ignored in the present paper except in quotations of the variant readings.

prefixed in a number of instances to the infinitive construct.² Yet there are instances in which the purpose of additional particles found in the Scroll is more ambiguous.

Now with regard to their possible purpose, the variant readings which are the subject of the following remarks can be divided into two broad types. The first comprises instances which appear to aim at preventing an erroneous or irreverent interpretation of a given passage, especially where such an interpretation could result from too literal an approach to the text. The second type may have the more positive purpose of giving expression or emphasis to particular religious views or sentiments.

Turning to the first type of variants, we find the following examples:

iv, 2. The Scroll has at the end of this verse the additional word **ויהודה**. The effect of this is to make Judah expressly share in the idyllic future painted by the prophet, though there is little reason to believe that **לפלישת ישראל** in the MT. is limited to the "escaped" of the northern kingdom. The additional word may be due to the influence of the metaphors in ch. v, 7, where the house of Israel is described as the "vineyard of the Lord" and the man of Judah as his "pleasant plant," which correspond to the "sprout of the Lord" and "the fruit of the earth" in iv, 2. Or, again, it is possible that **ויהודה** is a mere echo of **פלישת בית יהודה** in xxxvii, 31.³ Be that as it may, the addition in iv, 2, is best explained by the supposition that it was intended to make it unequivocally clear that both the northern and the southern kingdoms are destined to enjoy the future predicted by the prophet.

xxix, 13. **ותהי יראתם אתי מצות אנשים מלמדה**; the Scroll reads **מצות (+כ)**.

The additional preposition is consistent with the tendency in the Scroll to avoid parataxis and may serve here to make the subtle adverbial clause explicit. It may be equally possible, however, that the preposition was intended to guard against the interpretation that the fear of God might conceivably be the precept of *men*. It is precisely in this sense that the Karaites, for example, distinguish in their polemics between **דרך התורה** and **מצות אנשים מלמדה** the latter phrase meaning for them the Mishnah and Gemara.⁴

² See, for example, i, 20; ix, 13; xxxii, 14, 17; xxxvi, 9; xxxvii, 38; xlix, 4; and lviii, 4; and cf. i, 12 and lviii, 13, where parallels are involved.

³ Here, however, the reference is clearly limited to the southern kingdom.

⁴ See N. WIEDER, *The Doctrine of the two Messiahs among the Karaites*, in the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 1955, Vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 24-25.

xlv, 18. The following is the MT. reading, two additional conjunctions in the Scroll being indicated in brackets:

כי כה אמר יהוה בורא השמים הוא האלהים
(ו) יצר הארץ ועשה (ו) הוא כוננה

The first line would offer no difficulty even to the most literally-minded exegete, but this is not the case with the second line. For although the first line asserts that Yahweh is the creator of the heavens and that He is God, the second line would when interpreted literally merely yield the circuitous definition "he that formed the earth and made it, he established it." The effect of the two additional conjunctions in the Scroll is to prevent just this interpretation. The poetically balanced parallels of the MT. are obliterated and their place is taken by the naïvely prosaic but didactic and ambiguity-proof statement: "... and the creator (lit.: former) of the earth and its maker and he established it." It is difficult to believe that the gain in explicitness, resulting from the fact that the formally independent *subjects* יצר and עשה become *predicates* on a par with הוא האלהים, is purely coincident with conjunctions intended as stylistic modifications.

xlviii, 16. כא מראש בפתר דברתי מעת היותה שם אני; the Scroll reads בעת for מעת—which is significant in view of the fact that agreement of prepositions in parallel clauses is found more frequently in the Scroll than in the MT. The Scroll reading could be accidental, but it is an essential consideration that the variation provides against the ambiguity of the word היותה. For in verse 16 it has an impersonal subject and in all probability refers to the summoning of Cyrus, but it could erroneously be taken to refer to the Creation spoken of in verse 13 and thus imply that God's existence begins with the Creation.

lvi, 6. ובני הנכר הנלוים על יהוה לשרתו ולאהבה את שם יהוה. להיות לו לעבדים כל שמר שבת מחללו ומחזיקים בבריתי. The Scroll reads: ובני הנכר הנלוים על יהוה להיות לו לעבדים. ולברך את שם יהוה. Now while it is difficult to account for the omission of לאהבה, we venture to suggest that the omission of לשרתו may have been prompted by the desire to exclude an interpretation which would take the latter word in the sense of ministering to Yahweh in a capacity of Priests and Levites.

The LXX had the word לשרתו in their Vorlage, yet their rendering suggests the possible existence of a divergent Jewish tradition. Thus the LXX reading in lvi, 6, "that they may be to him for bondmen

and bondwomen," presupposes a Hebrew text להיות לו לעבדים ולשפחות. This, like its shorter counterpart in the MT., may well be explanatory of לשרתו and in that case the express mention of "bondwomen" would by implication rule out the possibility that Priestly and Levitical services would be rendered by the "Strangers." What is perhaps more significant is that Codex B of the LXX reads in lvi, 6, "being to him bondmen," etc., or "by being," etc., an expression in the style of Aquila⁵ which pointedly defines, we think, what is meant by לשרתו. It would not be surprising, therefore, if the Scroll resolved the difficulty by omitting the word with the effect that lvi, 6, is brought more closely into line with xiv, 2, according to which the *gerim* are to be bondmen and bondwomen to the children of Israel and in an altogether abject position, as well as with the tenor of lxi, 6.

lxiv, 9. ציון מדבר היתה ירושלם שממה; the Scroll reads מדבר (+כ) and ממה (+ו) ש (i.e., *shomemah*)—terms which appear to soften the harshness of the otherwise perfect parallels of the MT.

lxvi, 16. כי נאש יהוה נשפט ובחרבו את-כל-בשר; the Scroll reads נשפט for יבוא לשפוט.

The Scroll reading is consistent with its motive being to preclude the irreverent construction which would result if the verb were taken in the purely passive sense of "to be judged." The variation, incidentally, involves a subtle change of meaning from את as="with" to את as=the accusative particle.

We turn now to consider the second type of variant readings. These admit of explanations in terms of diverse considerations of a religious nature.

xix, 20. כי יצעקו אל יהוה... וישלח להם מושיע רב והצילם; the Scroll reads וירד for רב and וישלח (or: ישלח)⁶ for וישלח.

⁵ R. R. OTTLEY, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, Cambridge, 1909, note *ad loc.* The M.T. reading in lxvi, 21, *lakkohanim laleviyyim* may also be tendentious, as the following considerations would appear to suggest. The LXX and Targum reflect a Hebrew text in which the above words had indefinite prepositions or none at all, though two MSS. of the Targum have מחר לכהנא and לשמשא לכהנא respectively (see J. F. STENNING's apparatus in *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford, 1949). These last two readings appear to reflect some uneasiness lest it might be understood erroneously that the "strangers" will be taken to serve as Priests and Levites. The reading in Codex A of the LXX shows that its Vorlage had the word ל after אקח, which is also the reading of the Scroll. Clearly, if one reads the words לכהנא ללויים in the Scroll with definite prepositions לא must be taken as *dativus commodi*; i.e., "I will take me for the Priests for the Levites," a somewhat light-hearted tone for a solemn declaration. The Massoretic pointing *lakkohanim laleviyyim* suggests that either the foreigners bringing the children of Israel back to their land or the vehicles mentioned in the complement will be taken to serve the Priests and the Levites.

⁶ Plate XV, line 28, in the Scroll shows that the letter transcribed on the page facing the plate as waw might be yodh.

It has been suggested that the protasis is to be understood here to be "when they cry unto the Lord, etc., that he may send them a saviour"⁷ and that this would make Yahweh quite naturally the subject of the last two verbs in the apodosis.⁸ It is questionable, however, whether, in view of the distance that separates the imperfect (with simple *waw*) of the verb "send" from the verb "cry," the suggested construction is syntactically defensible.⁹ On the other hand, the Scroll reading ושלח (or ישלח) accords with normal Biblical usage to employ a perfect consecutive (or a bare imperfect) in the apodosis of a conditional or causal construction.¹⁰ Now while the Scroll reading relieves the verse of the embarrassing ורב, which could be taken as an additional *nomen agentis* and would go ill with the verb והצילם in the singular, one is still left in doubt as to whether God or a saviour other than He will execute the deliverance. The Scroll reading וירד points, however, to a saviour of a supramundane order whose abode is on high, unless indeed the verb is merely used in the idiomatic sense of "going down to Egypt."

xxvi, 4. מתים בליהיו ונו" ותאבד כל זכר למו; the Scroll reads ותאבד for ותאמר.

This curious variant can hardly be due to an error of the purely mechanical kind. If it is an error the conscious attitude of the scribe to the text may have been a contributory cause, since the variant admits, we think, of a reasonable explanation if ותאמר is taken in its post-exilic meaning "and thou didst forbid."

It is important to note that while, according to the MT, the very memory of the lords who have formerly had dominion over Israel is said to have been utterly destroyed by God, it is not so according to the Scroll reading. The latter asserts that God had forbidden the memory of Israel's former rulers. Clearly, the word *zekher* as used by the Scroll can either be a metaphor for "vestige" or be taken in the more literal sense of *memory*, *remembrance*, or *memorial*, but taken as the object of the verb "forbid" it cannot possibly have reference to something blotted out, which

⁷ ICC, *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1928, p. 340.

⁸ Phil, n., at p. 342.

⁹ ICC's argument relies on S. R. DRIVER's *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, Oxford, 1892, § 136 and § 62, but the examples in the first are not exhaustive, and in the second not apposite to the construction under discussion.

¹⁰ Two of the MSS. utilised by STENNING for his edition of the *Targum of Isaiah* also read ושלח, while three others have וישלח (see text and apparatus).

ex hypothesi cannot come back. Yet the prohibition could be explained without difficulty as relating to practices reminiscent of cultic rites of the former lords. Such an interpretation would point to a possible motive for the variant. That is to say, the Scroll, if one may be permitted this convenient personification, appears to fight shy of the assertion that no vestige of foreign cultic rites remains or is ever likely to reappear in Israel. The reading "*and thou didst forbid*" by implication declares possible present and future lapses from exclusive loyalty to Yahweh to be a transgression of His command. The Scroll passage xxvi, 14, makes assurance doubly sure. On the one hand, it records, like the corresponding passage in the MT, Israel's loyalty to Yahweh even under foreign rulers and the utter destruction of the latter; yet on the other hand, unlike the MT passage, it obliquely warns Israel against any memory (or memorial) of foreign masters. In other words: whereas the MT passage is purely a recital of events which have happened in the past, the Scroll contrives to read into the passage also a prohibition which has reference to the future.¹¹

It remains to point out that the use of the verb **אָסַר** makes it unlikely that the Scroll reading is original, since the verb does not occur in OT Hebrew in the sense of "forbid," though the usage is common enough in later Hebrew. It is perhaps of some significance that the usage is found in a Qumran Hebrew MS,¹² that is, if the reconstruction of the text alluded to can be relied on. Curiously enough, this post-exilic document purports to give words spoken by Moses and affects a Biblical style.

xli, 2. **מִי הָעִיר מִמִּזְרַח צָרָה יִקְרָאוּ לְרַגְלֵי יִתָּן לִפְנֵי נָוִים וּמַלְכִּים יִרָד**
The Scroll has a *waw* prefixed to the second and third verbs and reads **יִרָד** for **יִרָד**.

Now while according to the Massoretic accentuation **צָרָה** cannot be the object of the verb, it must necessarily be so according to the Scroll reading. This consideration, coupled with the fact that also the ancient Versions take *sedeq* to be the object, has led D. BARTHELEMY¹³ to form the impression that the Sopherim had

¹¹ It is interesting that in the Targum rendering the foreign *nations* are described as still serving "the dead who shall not live, their heroes who shall not rise" and then follows: "therefore thou (*i.e.*, God) shalt destroy them all and make their memory perish." Like the users of the Scroll the Targumist must have felt in his own way that Is. xxvi, 14, did not correspond to the reality of his time.

¹² *Qumran Cave I*, ed. D. BARTHÉLEMY, O.P., and J. T. MILIK, Oxford, 1955, I, Q, 22, col. III, line 11.

¹³ *Revue Biblique*, 1950, No. 4, p. 548.

endeavoured to avoid at all costs the "spontaneous" reading of the Versions and of the Scroll, perhaps in order to combat a messianic interpretation given to the passage by some Jewish sectarians. Although BARTHELEMY includes the variant among the "variantes messianiques," it is not clear to what extent, if any, his suspicion of the Sopherim is based on the assumption that the tense-construction in verse 2 in the Scroll is or might be original. It is relevant therefore to point out that if the *waw* prefixed to the verbs is taken as conjunctive, the construction will be plainly against Biblical usage, whether the passage as a whole or in part is understood in a past or future sense. On the other hand, if the *waw* is taken as consecutive the passage must be given a *past* sense and cannot be "messianic." Furthermore, one would expect the form הוריד when the *waw*-consecutive becomes detached from the verb. There are valid reasons, therefore, to believe that the Scroll reading is not original. It may well be that someone interested in giving the passage a "messianic" significance has dealt inadequately with the tense-construction. It must be insisted, however, that the only conclusion warranted by the Scroll reading is that it envisages some person or other designated *šedeq* and this conclusion is independent of the correctness or otherwise of the syntax of the passage—it follows from the fact that a *waw* is prefixed to יקראהו. The Scroll reading does not shed light on the identity or nature of the figure *šedeq* and to go beyond this would be illegitimate speculation.

xli, 3. At the end of this verse the Scroll reads לוא יבינו for the MT לא יבוא.

It must be noted that, far from being odd, the Scroll reading makes sense if the words לוא יבינו are read at the beginning of what is now verse 4 in the MT. This would yield, and we believe was meant to yield, the text לוא יבינו מי פעל ועשה. Accordingly, verse 4 would be affirmative and not rhetorically interrogative as it is in the MT. "They understand not who hath wrought and done" would refer to the nations summoned by Yahweh to a controversy to determine whether their gods are supreme or He. This much is implicit in the MT, but the Scroll makes it explicit and does so by introducing a phrase which in its context bears a close resemblance to one in verse 20 of chapter xlv, as the following comparison shows:

xlv, 20. "they have no knowledge that carry wood of their graven image. . . . Declare ye, and bring forth . . . who hath

shewed this from ancient time ? who hath declared it of old ? ”

xli, 4. “ they understand not who hath wrought and done, he that calleth the generations from the beginning.”

In view of the striking affinity which chapter xli has with chapter xlv in structure, phraseology, and ideas, one must reckon with the possibility that the phrase “ they understand not ” was introduced into the Scroll under the influence of verse 20 in chapter xlv, in order to round off the characterisation of the idolatrous world after the pattern of that chapter.

Our discussion has so far proceeded on the tacit assumption that the Scroll reading is not original. Indeed, three considerations combine in support of this assumption. First, the phrase is not found in the ancient Versions. Second, although the LXX attests a Hebrew text *יעבר שלום ארה ברנליו* in verse 3, it begins verse 4 exactly like the MT. Third, a telling consideration against the Scroll reading being original, is the logical hiatus between “ they understand not who hath wrought and done ” and “ he that calleth the generations from the beginning.”

xlv, 7. *יוצר אור ובורא חשך עשה שלום וברא רע*; the Scroll reads *שלו* for *מוב*.

It has often been pointed out that in the MT reading *רע* is used in antithesis to *שׁוֹמ* (well-being) and is to be understood as “ misfortune.” In the Scroll reading, however, *מוב* and *רע* could have moral connotations and the reading may thus be an affirmation of the doctrine of the sectaries of Qumran, who held that both good and evil are created by God and that the morally good or bad in human conduct is predetermined by Him, at least for the duration of the period preceding the ultimate “ visitation.”

xlvi, 1. *כרע בל קרם נבו היו עצבוהם לחיה ולבהמה נשאתיכם*; the Scroll reads *משמיעיחמה* for *משא לעיפה*.

The exegesis of the MT passage is notoriously difficult. Ibn Ezra and Qimḥi, for example, explain *לחיה ולבהמה* as meaning that the Babylonian idols are assigned to animals and beasts in order to be carried away. Thereafter the two exegetes part company: Ibn Ezra equates *nesu'oth* with the beasts, while Qimḥi takes the word to refer to the idols as the burden borne by the beasts. So far as the MT reading is concerned, Qimḥi's explanation is clearly the better of the two, the passive form *nesu'ah* being more appropriate for what is carried than for the carrier. But even Qimḥi's explanation fails to resolve the difficulty inherent in the

MT passage which follows. Verse 2 in the MT says: "they stoop, they bow down, together they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity." Now, it is a little difficult to understand to whom these words refer. If by *nesu'oth* is meant the burden, it would scarcely seem likely that it was the prophet's intention to make the paradoxical point that the *nesu'oth* could not deliver the *massa'*. On the other hand, if by *nesu'oth* are meant the beasts, the satire that they, too, are gone into captivity would be palpably weak. There is ground for the belief, therefore, that verses 1-2 may have suffered corruption.¹⁴ As against this, it can be shown that the Scroll reading *משמיעיהמה*, although possibly an attempt at quasi-editorial improvement, yields tolerably good sense and a self-sufficient explanation of verses 1-2.

The modern view, embodied also in the RV, is that *נשאתיכם* is to be understood as meaning "the things that ye carried about." This appears to us to offer the only possible clue to the understanding of the Scroll version. That is to say, the picture resulting from the Scroll reading is that the '*ašabim*, the idols, who are themselves loaded upon the beasts, are burdened with the weight of their *mashmi'im*, i.e., those who proclaim them, their adherents.¹⁵ It is, moreover, a plausible supposition that '*ašabim* were replicas of Bel and Nebo worshipped by the people and carried about by them. Such a supposition would explain the possessive suffix *הם* and would suggest that a large number of Bel's and Nebo's worshippers were attempting to escape from Babylon on the beasts carrying the '*ašabim*.

The proposed explanation of the Scroll reading would bring out the full contrast offered by verses 3-4 where the house of Jacob is described by God as having been borne from belly and carried from the womb^{15a} and end with the words "and even to old age I am he, and even to hoar hairs will I carry: I have made, and I will bear; yea I will carry and deliver."

If *mashmi'im* could mean those who profess Bel and Nebo, verses 1-2 would contain elements antithetically parallel to those found in verses 3-4, that is, the Babylonians in contrast to the house

¹⁴ For a comprehensive, if not entirely convincing, explanation of the MT passage on the lines of the Targum rendering, see C. C. TORREY, *The Second Isaiah*, Edinburgh, 1928, commentary *ad loc.*

¹⁵ See following note.

^{15a} The seemingly active forms of the last two verbs in the Scroll as well as the reading *ממני*, can only be explained as an error.

of Jacob, and *nesu'oth*—an epithet for the man-made and man-carried idol described in verse 7—in contrast to Yahweh.

The foregoing interpretation is, however, not without its difficulty, since the participle *mashmi'im* does not occur in the OT in the clear sense of “announcers” or “proclaimers.”¹⁶ Yet it would seem that the word is an essential element in the picture, because it emphasises the doom of the Babylonian idolaters no less than that of their idols. Such a consideration could have inspired the Scroll reading, which, whether original or not, is exegetically not unattractive. The term *mashmi'im* could be explained, however, more simply, as the equivalent of *musicians* and might well be an echo of the phrase *ומצלתים למשמיעים* in I Ch. xvi, 42. This explanation would suggest that Bel and Nebo, as well as those who had ministered to them by singing their praises, were doomed to perdition. In their function of musicians the *mashmi'im* could vicariously represent the Babylonian worshippers.

lii, 12. The Scroll has at the end of this verse the additional words *אלוהי כול הארץ יקרא*. This, it will be observed, impairs the parallels by the introduction of the new predicate *יקרא* which is without a parallel in the first part of the verse. MILLAR BURROWS¹⁷ has suggested that the addition may be due to the influence of liv, 5, yet one cannot help noticing how much more apposite the addendum is in lii, 12. For its obvious purpose is to explain that the redemption of Israel will be acknowledged by all nations as the work of the one and only God and that there will therefore be no one to harass the Children of Israel or cause them to depart in haste. One cannot overlook, however, another possible explanation, though not necessarily an alternative to the one given above.

Attention has been drawn by various commentaries to the fact that the words “for ye shall not go out in haste” are strongly evocative of the exodus from Egypt, whether or not they are expressly chosen as a contrast to Deuteronomy xvi, 3. From such an association of ideas there would be but a short step to the further contrast of the formula *יהוה אלהי העברים* used by Moses and Aaron in their demands of the unresponsive Pharaoh and the formula *יהוה אלוהי כול הארץ*, which in the context of lii, 12,

¹⁶ The nearest instance is in Is. xli, 26; in lii, 7 (twice), and in Na. ii, 1, the participle is in the constr. st. and part of an adjectival phrase to *mebhasser*, while in Je. iv, 15, it is part of the predicate of the implied *Kol*.

¹⁷ *BASOR*, 1948, No. 111, p. 19—a comment incidental to the listing of the variant readings of the Scroll.

implies ready willingness on the part of the nations to release the Children of Israel from their midst. One suspects that a midrashic exposition may underlie the addendum, and one is even tempted to think of such a midrash as being introduced by the words "for not like the former redemption will be the latter redemption"—a vision of a **פסח לעתיד**, to borrow the refrain of a piyyuṭ in the Passover liturgy.

Two variants which may be subsumed under the heading "eschatological" remain to be considered.

xlii, 1. **נתתי רוחי עליו משפט לנזים יוציא**; the Scroll reads **משפט ומשפט** for **משפט**

BARTHELEMY,¹⁸ who first called attention to this variant, translates the last three words "promulgera sa religion pour les nations." He is careful to point out, however, that "religion" is an inadequate term and that *mishpat* is to be understood in the context as the totality of rules to govern human action in conformity with the divine design.¹⁹ In trying to explain the absence of the suffix in the MT reading BARTHELEMY goes on to say: "could it be that 'his religion' shocked certain Sopherim, especially being placed as it is: in the first line of the poem."²⁰ He admits that verse 4 in the MT contains the word **ולתורתו** "which has not been corrected," but adds that "the corrections, if such they be in the present case, lack sometimes logic, and on the other hand the construction 'the isles shall wait for his law' rendered it more difficult to suppress the suffix."²¹ Now, much of this is rather unrewarding speculation, since it is difficult to think of any criteria which would help one determine whether the Scroll reading or that of the MT is original. The objective effect of the Scroll reading is, surely, this: if the additional suffix is taken to be in the singular, it will not import into the passage anything which is not implicit already in the term **תורתו** in verse 4 in the MT. On the other hand, if, on analogy with the suffix **זרועו** (twice) in DSIa li, 5, the suffix is taken to be in the plural the effect will be to tilt the scales slightly in favour of interpreting the terms "Servant" and "Elect" in verse 1 as having reference to an individual, since the plural form would accentuate the sense of "judgments" or "edicts" promulgated by the

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 547-8.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 547, note 1.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 547.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 548.

Servant.²² One consideration in favour of reading the suffix as that of the plural is of an orthographic nature, viz., that while *משפט* of the MT becomes in the Scroll *ומשפטו*, and *ולתורתו* of the MT becomes *ולתורתיו*. A possible explanation of this is that the suffix of *mishpat* is that of the plural, while that of *torah* is that of the singular, both usages being well attested in the Qumran MSS.²³ On the other hand, there is clear evidence that the sectaries of Qumran used the term "Elect" also in a corporate sense. Thus, for example, the *Pesher Habakkuk*²⁴ contains an eschatological passage in which God's Elect, in the plural (*behiraw*), are spoken of as executing "judgments" on the nations at the consummation of the "last epoch." At the same time it is clear from the *Pesher* passage that the Elect of God are not identical with the whole of Israel, but are conceived as a faithful remnant such as the sectaries of Qumran regarded themselves to be.²⁵ If the term "Elect" goes back, as is generally assumed with regard to its use in other pseudepigrapha, to xlii, 1, due weight must be given to the possibility that there is in the Qumran MSS a certain oscillation between the individual and corporate aspects of the term "Elect." Yet, although the sect collectively and the individual "Elect" may have distinct eschatological missions, the two concepts need not be mutually exclusive. We may postpone our conclusion on this point until we have examined the next variant.

li, 5. *קרוב צדקי יצא ישעי וזרעי עמים ישפטו אלי איים יקון ואל וזרעי ייחלון*. The Scroll reads *זרועו* (twice), *אליו* and *יוחילון*.

W. H. BROWNLEE,²⁶ amplifying a suggestion made by BARTHELEMY,²⁷ has pointed out that the logical antecedent of *זרועו* must be taken to be *ישעי* and concludes that *ישע* must therefore be the title of a coming person who is to be the saviour of the

²² On the term *mishpat* cf. H. H. ROWLEY, *The Servant of the Lord*, London, 1954, p. 14 and references to other writers, *ibid.*, note 2. The present writer is inclined to equate *mishpat* in xlii, 1, with a declaratory judgment; this seems to accord with the use of the verb *hoši*.

²³ See *Qumran Cave I*, p. 127, note to line 28, and p. 109 (penultimate paragraph of introductory remarks). See also Z. BEN. HAYYIM in *Sepher Asaph*, Jerusalem, 1953, Appendix, pp. 94-5.

²⁴ Col. V, line 4.

²⁵ For a full discussion of the problems involved see K. ELLIGER, *Studien zum Habakuk—Kommentar von Toten Meer*, Tübingen, 1953, pp. 139-140 and p. 182, and *Qumran Cave I*, p. 141, for references to the term "Elect of God" in other writings of the Sect.

²⁶ *The United Presbyterian* of November 29, 1954, pp. 6-7, and see also the same publication for December 13, 1954, pp. 10-11, and for December 27, 1954, p. 10 and p. 13.

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 548.

world, a Messiah promised to the Jewish nation and not a personified Israel.

There is, indeed, a difference between the views of BARTHELEMY and BROWNLEE, for while the latter treats the variants under discussion as the product of the sectaries of Qumran, the former goes a long way towards suggesting that the Scroll readings may represent original readings suppressed by the scribes and priests, to whom the mere claim of a temporal "messianisme" was repugnant.²⁸ The problem, however, is not by any means so simple as the treatment of the variants by BARTHELEMY and BROWNLEE would suggest. To begin with, assuming, as BARTHELEMY implicitly does, that the suffixes in the Scroll readings in xlii, 1, and li, 5, have reference to one and the same eschatological figure, there is nothing to preclude the supposition that these suffixes are harmonistic modifications occasioned by the original passage "the isles shall wait for *his law*" in xlii, 4. Such harmonistic devices are found elsewhere in the Scroll and seem to have been a feature of the hermeneutics of its users.²⁹ Again, on BROWNLEE'S view one would have to assume that the sectaries have read into li, 5, the expectation of a personal Messiah rather than the collective concept of "the Chosen Ones of God" both of which appear to have been part of their settled doctrine. Such a view, though possible, would be open to the objection that the Qumran writings speak of *two* Messiahs, one of Israel and the other of Aaron. Does the problem of the Scroll readings in li, 5, admit then of a clear-cut solution? The answer to this question must be, we think, in the affirmative, and it would seem to favour BROWNLEE'S rather than BARTHELEMY'S view. Two considerations argue against the latter's view: (a) the passage "and his arms shall judge nations" in li, 5, is scarcely in accord with the gentle nature of the eschatological figure in xlii, 2-3, and (b) while the designations '*ebedh* and *bahir*' appear to be natural in the context of xlii, 1-4, the personified "Salvation" in li, 5, strikes one as artificial. Now the *Benedictions* MS., recovered from Cave I at Qumran³⁰ and published recently, shows that while the *Priestly Mashiah* would seem to take precedence over the

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Compare, for example, the following: DSIa xxxvii, 20, with 2 Ki. xix, 19; DSIa xxxviii, 6, with Is. xxxvii, 35; DSIa li, 3, with Is. li, 11, and xxxv, 10; DSIa lii, 12, with Is. liv, 5; and DSIa lii, 8, with Ze. i, 16. Compare also DSIa ix, 6, with 2 Sa. vii, 12-13, 1 Ch. xvii, 11-12, 14, and xxviii, 7.

³⁰ *Qumran Cave I*, 28b, at pp. 118-129.

secular *Nasi'*,³¹ it is the latter who is expected to play the militant rôle against the nations. What is predicated of him in terms of various OT passages suggests a figure at once wholly righteous and one invincible in battle, probably even Davidic of origin.³² The *Nasi'* may well be regarded therefore as the leader of the Sect of God's Elect in the final "judgments" to be executed against the nations in the end of days. It is an eschatological figure like the *Nasi'* of the Qumran *Benedictions* that is reflected in the Scroll reading in li, 5. Yet, it is important to stress again that while on this interpretation the Scroll passage li, 5, cannot be reconciled with the tenor of xlii, 1-4, no such incompatibility exists between the corresponding passages in the MT. On balance we are inclined to believe, therefore, that the personification of *yeshā'* was introduced into li, 5, in order to link the passage up, albeit erroneously, with xlii, 1, by providing a synonym to '*ebedh* and *baḥir*—a purpose which could be achieved by minimal variations. Such a procedure need not be taken as a reflection on the intellectual integrity of the users of the Scroll; the occurrence in both passages of the idea of "judgment" and of the picture of the expectant isles, could account for a common *bona fide* interpretation. Whether the Scroll reading *ומשפטר* in xlii, 1, is original or not is a question which, in our opinion, does not admit of a definite answer, but in either case the tenor of the passage would not be radically affected. Clearly, it is the divine spirit with which the Elect is expressly invested that is the source of both the judgment(s) he issues and the instruction he gives, and this interpretation is scarcely affected by the possessive suffix in the Scroll reading.

ARIE RUBINSTEIN.

Manchester.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 121 (bottom).

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 127-129.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF *SEDER ELIYAHU*

The midrash known as *Seder Eliyahu* (*SE*) or *Tanna debe Eliyahu* (*TdbE*) is, by common consent, one of the most baffling and intractable midrashim in our possession. Authorship, date, place of origin, and relation to other texts have all been the subject of the most divergent views. What has not received sufficient attention so far is the preliminary understanding of the nature of the text itself. This text is admittedly faulty and corrupt, often beyond restoration. It is hardly of a nature to permit, let alone encourage, far-reaching conclusions. Even so, it contains well-rounded, closely knit chapters, pericopes, homilies, or whatever we choose to call them. It is this feature which makes the *SE* a genuine *midrash* as distinct from a *yalkut*. Its pericopes are coherent, well-developed expositions of specific themes, although it may often be difficult to follow the thread of the argument in the maze of incidental matter and tangential excursions.

The bewildering and confused presentation of the material suggests the existence of simpler, primary sources which our author has strung together on the thread of his associations. An illustrative, though in no way analogous, example of this procedure is the composition of the *Zohar*. It is easy, when opening any page of the *Zohar*, to isolate the midrashic material present in the author's mind. But the associations by which they are joined together, the manner in which they coalesce, the new meaning with which they are invested—all these are the author's own. Similarly, it may be useful to analyse the structure of the homilies of *SE*. Our immediate interest here is not in the usual distinction between "original text" and "interpolations"; these categories are altogether inadequate for an understanding of the basic nature of the text. We have to ask ourselves: what are the elements, the bricks as it were, which the author's mind built into a coherent structure?

This, of course, takes the composite nature of *SE* for granted. In fact, much has been written to show that the "sources" of *SE* are to be found in the parallel sayings of the Talmud or, conversely, that the dependence is the other way round. Practically all the relevant material has been collected by Friedmann in his monumental Introduction and in his notes to the text¹; the dispute now is

¹ *Seder Eliyahu Rabba ve-Seder Eliyahu Zuta*, Vienna, 1902.

mainly one of interpretation. The latest authoritative pronouncement on the subject was made by Professor Albeck in his supplementary notes to the Hebrew ed. of Zunz' *Gottesdienstl. Vorträge*²: בדרך כלל יש לאמר שרוב מאמרי הבבלי המקבילים לם"א ונפרשו במבוא לא"ש מאמר הדו שימשו מקור להחברנו.

The following note does not claim to take part in this discussion. Its purpose is more restricted as it merely wants to present one or two examples of textual analysis. The texts used have been chosen from patently early material, so that they cannot be used as dating evidence. Obviously only a thorough analysis of the complete *SE* can test the value and usefulness of this method and permit any valid conclusions. In the meantime it is left to the reader's individual taste whether he regards *SE*'s baroque versions of aggadic material as more original and primitive than the simpler, more transparent, and, as it were, more classical lines of the Talmudic parallels.

I

SER ch. 10, § 1; Friedmann, p. 48.³

Chapters 10-11 are primarily a midrash on Deborah, though there is much reference to the period of the Judges generally. The pericope is connected by many threads with the preceding chapters; cf. p. 46, שלא יאכל ע"ג נוי, p. 48, and again p. 61. The over-all theme is divine justice,⁴ as is borne out by the summing up of chapters 10-12 at the end of ch. 12.⁵ Nevertheless, the first paragraph of ch. 10 is by itself sufficiently self-contained to allow for an independent analysis.

The paragraph actually has three themes: (1) The salutary influence of a virtuous woman as contrasted with the disastrous influence of a wicked wife (Jezebel).⁶ (2) A midrash on the name *Lapidoth*. (3) A midrash explaining how and why Deborah merited the distinction of becoming prophetess and leader of her people. Our chapter opens with No. 3. The phrase וכי מה טיבה של דבורה corresponds to the more ומתנבאת עליהם,

² *Haderashoth be-Yisrael*, Jerusalem, 1954, p. 294, n. 141. MARGOLIES' more recent attempt to defend FRIEDMANN'S "Tannaitic" dating (in *Sepher Assaph*, Jerusalem, 1953, p. 370ff. (לביעה קדמיתו של ס' סדר אליה) is not very convincing.

³ For reasons of space economy I merely refer to Friedmann's ed. instead of quoting in full the texts to be discussed.

⁴ Cf. M. KADUSHIN, *The Theology of SE*, 1932, p. 163f.

⁵ FRIEDMANN, pp. 58-9.

⁶ Cf. also *Prov.* 14, 1, and *Yalkut*, where this verse is applied to 'On b. Peleth; cf. also b. *Sanh.* 109b.

⁷ Cf. also FRIEDMANN, p. 57, וכי מה טיבה של איתה פילגש שהביאה ונתנה אצל שופט, וכי מה טיבה של דבורה אצל ברק, and p. 50.

familiar **במה זכתה**. The question conforms to a conventional aggadic pattern.⁸ The expected answer should contain an instance of outstanding piety or virtue. In our case it begins with **אמרו בעלה** של **דבורה עם הארץ היה מעיר אנ**. The explosive interjection of which our author is particularly fond, rather interrupts the plain and smooth course of the exposition, though it anticipates the answer.

If the question and answer concerning Deborah's qualification and merits constitute the frame of our paragraph, then the midrash on *Lapidoth*, which provides the answer, is its central part. Originally we may imagine it to have run somewhat like this: **מאי אשת** or, as *b. Megillah* 14a has it: **לפידות**. The answer plays on the meaning "torch, light." The version *Megillah* 14a possibly means to explain *Lapidoth* as qualifying Deborah without necessarily suggesting that it was her husband's name. At any rate, the question as to the reason for Deborah's prophecy receives a more logical answer only if we assume *her* to have made the wicks. This is quite plain in the version quoted by *Yalkut*: **תנא דבי אליהו בעלה של דבורה עם הארץ היה א"ל בוא ואעשה לך פתילות ולך לבית המקדש שבשילה . . . והיא עושה פתילות והוא מוליך לבית המקדש. וני שמות יש לו . . . לפידות ע"ש שאשתו עושה פתילות והיא מתבוננת ועושה פתילות עבות כדי שיהא אורן מרובה והקב"ה בוחן לבות וכליות אמר לה דבורה את נתכוונת להרבות אורי אף אני ארבה אורך . . . מי זכה לו ללפידות . . .**

"Light" as the *tertium comparationis* between the wicks and the illumination of the *ruah hakkodes* makes good sense,⁹ whereas the reading of *SE* **ארבה אותך** (unless a scribal error for **אורך**) relies more on our guessing the connection.

All versions are agreed that Barak is one of those "holy fools" who serve God by menial labours of love. He certainly carried the wicks to the sanctuary at Shiloh. The question is who made the wicks: Deborah (*b. Megillah* and *TdbE* according to *Yalkut*) or Barak (*SE*). According to *SE*, Barak did the work, and Deborah was rewarded with the light of prophecy for her good idea! This may be considered a trifling point, but it is emphasised by the

8 *b. Meg.* 27b-28a. Cf. also *b. Yoma* 47a: **מה עשית שוכית לך**; *Kallah Rab.* vii: **מפני מה** and the question **למה זכ** (passim).

9 The association between the light of the *lapidim* and the Holy Spirit may be compared with the other midrash in our paragraph which accounts for *Lapidoth*'s first name, Barak **דברק** שפניו דומין לברק. This reminds one of the statement *Lev.R.* i (beginning) that Phineas is called an angel because **בשעה שהיתה יוח** דקדש שורה עליו דיו פניו בוערת כלפידים

stress on the supererogatory **וְהוּא הִיָּה עוֹשֶׂה פְתִילֹת עֲבוֹת וְכוּ**. If this was Barak's own initiative, known, like all matters of the heart, to the **בּוֹחֵן לְבוֹת וְכִנּוּיָּת** only, then its corresponding reward to Deborah becomes more difficult still.¹⁰ This uncertainty seems to be reflected in the confusion of our text: **אָמַר לָהּ דְּבוֹרָה**; **אַתָּה נִתְכוּנָתָה**. God's address wavers uncomfortably between Deborah and Barak (even if we do not, for obvious reasons, press the spelling **נִתְכוּנָתָה**).

It is tempting to assume two versions of the Lapidoth midrash. In the one Barak is identified with Lapidoth and the purpose is to explain **לְפִידוֹת שְׁמוֹ נִקְרָא**. The other version possibly took Lapidoth as an adjective of Deborah; it naturally lends itself to an explanation **לְמַה זָכְתָּה דְּבוֹרָה לְנִבּוּאָה**. This would well agree with the further point that the **בּוֹחֵן לְבוֹת** rewarded her according to her hidden intentions whilst making the wicks. The fragment b. *Megillah* 14a may come from such a midrash; *Yalkut*¹¹ is another instance of it. The text of *SE* would then appear to be a conflation of two versions. The pattern represented by b. *Megillah* and *Yalkut* (Lapidoth→Deborah making wicks→prophecy) is modified by another midrash which assumes that Barak justly earned the name Lapidoth by making wicks himself. The latter pattern is also represented by a saying preserved in its *original* form in *SE*: **נִי שְׁמוֹת יֵשׁ לּוֹ בָּרַק וּלְפִידוֹת וּמִיכָאֵל . . . לְפִידוֹת עַל שֵׁם שְׁהוּא . . . עוֹשֶׂה פְתִילֹת**. The result of the contamination of the two versions is visible in both *SE* and *Yalkut*. In *SE* the story itself is changed and made to conform to the midrash of the three names; Barak makes the wicks and his *inspiratrix* receives the gift of the Spirit. *Yalkut*, on the other hand, who would have done better without the intrusive **נִי שְׁמוֹת יֵשׁ לּוֹ**, succumbs to the "force of association" in the other direction. Since he holds that Deborah made the wicks herself, he has to adjust the reason for the name Lapidoth and to read: **לְפִידוֹת עַל שֵׁם שְׁאִשְׁתּוֹ עוֹשֶׂה פְתִילֹת**!

We may, therefore, arrange the elements of our midrash as follows:

(1) **וְלְמַה נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ לְפִידוֹת? אָמְרוּ בַּעֲלָהּ שֶׁל דְּבוֹרָה ע"ה הִיָּה אָמְרָה**

¹⁰ The cogency of this argument is considerably weakened if we remember the general aggadic tendency of conceiving of women's virtue as entirely passive. Their merit consists in enabling their menfolk to do good works; they are not 'osoth but me 'asoth (Dr. N. WIEDER in a private communication). Nevertheless, the text of *SE* as it stands and a comparison of the parallel versions seem to justify the above argument.

¹¹ Disregarding, for the moment, the passage beginning **נִי שְׁמוֹת יֵשׁ לּוֹ**

לו אשתו וכו' . . . והוא היה עושה פתילות . . . לפיכך נקרא שמו לפידות. This is the central part which provides the answer.

(2) אמרו ג' שמות יש לו וכו' . . . לפיכך נקרא שמו לפידות. This is an insertion due to association with לפידות שמו לפידות.

(3) וכו' מה טיבה של דבורה . . . הקב"ה בוחן לבות . . . אמר לה דבורה This, the opening question and concluding answer, is the frame of the paragraph as a whole.

(4) ומי גרם לו ללפידות שיחא מבני אדם כשרים . . . דבורה אשתו immediately follows the question by way of emphatic anticipation¹² of the answer.

(5) ומי גרם לו ללפידות שיחא מבני אדם כשרים . . . דבורה אשתו winds up with the moral lesson.

The words לפיכך נקרא שמו לפידות, which are a very fitting conclusion for our imagined unit No. 1, do not really fit into the pattern of our *SE* text. The *dénouement* הקב"ה בוחן לבות . . . אמר לה should follow immediately on והוא היה עושה פתילות עבות כרי. In this respect, too, the *Yalkut* version, though not *difficilior*, seems more original.

Friedmann¹³ takes it for granted that the passage b. *Megillah* 14a depends on our *SE* or a "similar text." It seems to me that in the light of the foregoing analysis everything will depend on what we mean by a "similar" text. The text of *SE* reveals such a composite and complicated structure that it is hardly possible to regard it as a primary source *tout court*.

II

SER ch. 11, Friedmann, pp. 52-3; continuation of the Deborah pericope.

Parallels adduced by Friedmann: b. *Sab.* 119b; b. *Ber.* 7b-8a (and the variant readings in Alfassi and *Yalkut*); b. *R.H.* 18a, *Gen. R.* 59, *Midr. Sam.* 8; b. *B.B.* 9b. To this add b. *Ned.* 32a.¹⁴

It is unnecessary to enumerate all the difficulties of the opening passage. There is no obvious connection between the first theme (*i.e.*, the response "Amen") and the subsequent disquisition on charity. The passage presents itself as a series of *derasoth* on *Ps.* 55: 19, but it is difficult to see the *prima facie* connection of this verse with the subject of *ṣedakah*.¹⁵

¹² I have desisted from a discussion of the internal problems of this interjection, as this would go beyond the range and purpose of the present paper.

¹³ *Introd.*, p. 57.

¹⁴ Cf. also FRIEDMANN'S remarks in his *Introd.*, p. 65.

¹⁵ See n. 18.

The skeleton of the text can be outlined as follows:

(1) *Ju.* 5:2 refers to them that bless God by responding "Amen."

(2a) They are also meant by *Ps.* 55:19.

(2b) *Ps.* 55:19 refers to daily Synagogue attendance.

(2c) *Ps.* 55:19 also refers to the charitable maintenance of a poor scholar and his dependents.

(3) Excursus on the efficacy of *ṣedakah* as an antidote to the power of evil forces, and a reference to the merit of saving a human life.

(4) A story illustrating the power of charity.

(5) On charity in general. Renewed reference to *Ps.* 55:19 involving the paradox that the practice of charity redeems God and Israel.

(6) The results for Israel of the practice, viz., neglect of charity.

(7) A doxological exclamation summing up the paradox of 5.¹⁶

(8) A further note on *mishpat* as bringing on the redemption.

Ad 1. Here we obviously have an alternative *derashah* to *Ju.* 5:2, an example of which is given b. *Sab.* 119b. The common feature of these *derashoth* is that they connect the call *ברכו* *ה'* with the *Kaddish*. This is explicitly done by the Talmud,¹⁷ whereas *SE* merely defines *bareku* as *ומברכין את הקב"ה באמן*. That this must be understood of public worship is further stressed by the cumbersome *בני אדם ש' הן משכימין ומעריבין לביה"כ ולביה"מ ומברכין אמן*.

Ad 2. b. *Ber.* 7b-8a deals explicitly and at some length with the value of public worship. Thereby it quite naturally associates with the *derashah* on the response "Amen." The principal proof-text in all the sayings b. *Ber.* 8a is *Ps.* 55:19, the operative phrase being, of course, *כי רבים היו עמדי*. There is nothing in this verse that could conceivably be connected with the virtue of charity or the study of the Law.¹⁸ Most probably the connection is produced

¹⁶ This cannot be discussed here as it has to be examined in conjunction with the other rhetorical interjections of *SE*, such as *מציד אין ברוך המקום אי ששמים* etc.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, כל העונה אמן יהא שמיה רבא מברך בכל כחו

¹⁸ Unless we assume the existence of three consecutive *derashoth* on this verse. There may be a philological "starting point" for such *derashoth* in the word *מקרב* which could be interpreted as "drawing nigh" (for prayer), as "offering" (sacrifice and, in lieu of sacrifice, charity), and as the "battle" of the *Thorah* (Dr. N. WIEDER in a private communication). Still, these midrashim, though not impossible, are not very probable and, to my knowledge, are not found in this form.

incidentally by the wording of the conclusion of R. Nathan's dictum^{18a}: אמר הקב"ה כל העוסק בתורה ובנמ"ח ומתפלל עם הציבור and we should attribute the appearance here of the conventional trinity תורה תפילה ונמ"ח to their stereotyped association, rather than to assume¹⁹ three consecutive *derasoth* (i.e., our Nos. 2a, 2b, 2c) on Ps. 55: 19.

The praise accorded to the maintenance of poor scholars (our 2c) deserves closer scrutiny. Not that there is anything strange about the idea as such; it is a favourite theme of Rabbinic ethics and preaching. But in our context which, as we shall presently see, leads up to an exhortation to *ṣedakah* pure and simple, the motif of the "poor *talmid hakam*" is a mark of oscillation. It represents, as it were, the transition from *Thorah* to *gemiluth hasadim*. R. Nathan's dictum mentioned study, charity, and communal prayer. *SE* begins with public worship and ends with charity. If the transition is due, as I would suggest, to the *Babli* passage, then we can understand the intrusion of the *talmid hakam* into what should be a straightforward homily on the superiority of *ṣedakah* even to *talmud thorah*.²⁰

Ad 3. The little note on the efficacy of *ṣedakah* that winds up the exposition of פדה בשלום נפשי also serves as a fitting transition to the following story (our No. 4), which is meant to illustrate the thesis that charity can ward off the angel of death. If the connecting ש in the phrase שאין לך סם חיים really links up with פדה בשלום, then "my soul" must not refer to God (as suggested by b. *Ber.* 8a and our subsequent text), nor to the poor scholar, but to the charitable man. Altogether, one would prefer the quotation from the *Mishnah Sanh.* 4: 5²¹ to follow immediately on פדה בשלום נפשי; in that case the word *nephesh* would account for the juxtaposition.²² As it is, the quotation rather awkwardly interrupts what should be a self-contained sentence of its own. The passage should obviously run: שאין לך סם חיים מלאך המות אלא: מדת צדקה בלבד שנא' כי יגרתיו ונני ואוכר מתן בסתר וכפה אף and is

^{18a} A hint may be given here to partisans of FRIEDMANN by pointing out that the attribution of this saying to R. Nathan could be construed as evidence of connection with *SE*. The prophet Elijah was wont to hold converse with R. Nathan; cf. FRIEDMANN's *Introd.*, pp. 45 and 47.

¹⁹ FRIEDMANN, *Introd.*, p. 65; cf. also note 18.

²⁰ *V. inf.*

²¹ Given by *SE* in the version of the *yerushalmi*.

²² This, in fact, is the reading of HAJDA's "revised version."

clearly based on b. *B.B.* 9b. The explicit reference to the angel of death presupposes a tradition that may or may not be implied by *B.B.* 9b but which is, at any rate, attested by b. *Ned.* 32a. There we are told that 'aph and hemah are two frightful and deadly demons. The phrasing of our passage may be due to the conflation of the 'aph-hemah motif (*B.B.* 9b) with a צוקה־סם חיים motif.

Ad 4. There follows an illustration of the power of *ṣedakah*. The comparison with the parallel account b. *R.H.* 18a led Friedmann²³ to the conclusion that הם כשני נפורים שונים שלא ידעו זה מזה. A close analysis of the text reveals familiar stylistic features. Compared with the baroque narration of *SE*, the Talmudic version is compressed, precise, and indulges in no superfluities.²⁴

SE Friedmann, p. 53

מעשה בב' משפחות של כהנים שבאו
לפני רי"ז
אמרו לו רבי, בנינו מתים בני י"ח
בני ט"ו בני י"ב
אמר להן לא הייתם אלא ממשפחת
בני עלי דכתיב . . .
אמרו לו רבי ומה עלינו לעשות
אמר להן כיון שמגיע בן לפרקו . . .
ותנו צדקה
ויבא מה שכתוב בו . . . ויציל את מי
שכתוב בו . . .
הלכו ועשו כן והצילו את עצמם מן
המיתה

b. *R.H.* 18a

1. ת"ר משפחה אחת היתה
בירושלים
שהיו מתיה מתין בני י"ח שנה
3. באו והודיעו את ריב"ז
אמר להם שמא ממשפחת עלי
אתם דכתיב ביה . . .
6. לכו ועסקו בתורה
- הלכו ועסקו בתורה
9. והיו קוראין אותה משפחת
משפחת ריב"ז על שמו

The question arises whether *SE* and b. *R.H.* present different versions of the same story or whether one is a tendentious rewriting of the other.

Some light is thrown on our story by a very similar account of R. Meir's visit to Mamla. The two versions in *Midr. Sam.* and *Gen.R.* are practically identical.

²³ *Intro.*, p. 49.

²⁴ Cf. l. 1. משפחה אחת, ע. משפחות של כהנים; l. 2. בני י"ח שנה, ע. בני י"ח ובני ט"ו; l. 4. לא הייתם אלא ממשפחת בני עלי, ע. שמא ממשפחת עלי אתם, l. 6.

Midr. Sam., ed. Buber, ch. 8: 4

ר' מאיר על לחדא אתרא דאקרי
ממלא
ומצא אות שחורי הראש
אמר להם תאמרו שמא ממשפחת עלי
אתם
והוא שכתוב בו . . .
אמרו לו רבי התפלל על נו
אמר להם התעסקו בצדקה ואחם
מאריכים ימים
קרא לפניהם הפסוק הזה עטרת וגו'
היכן היא מצויה בדרך צדקה וגו'

Gen. R., ch. 59, beginning

ואברהם זקן בא בימם . . . עטרת
תפארת שיבה
ר' מאיר אזל לממלא
ראה אותן כולן שחורי ראש
אמר להם תאמר ממשפחת בית עלי
אתם
דכתיב ביה . . .
אמר ליה רבי וכו'
לכו וטפלו בצדקה ואתם זוכים
לזקנה
מה טעמיה עטרת וגו'
והיכן היא מצויה בדרך צדקה וגו'

Of greater import is the similarity of structure between this story and the *SE* story of R. Yohanan b. Zakkay. In spite of differences of scenery and detail,²⁵ a *Formanalyse* reveals an identical pattern: meeting of the sage with the afflicted and short-lived group—immediate diagnosis of the cause—request for help—advice to practise a specific virtue²⁶—scriptural proof. Clearly the R. Meir story belongs to the same class as the *SE* version of R. Yohanan.

The Talmud b. *R.H.* 18a is therefore in the minority and the hypothesis that it preserves a tendentious arrangement of an original *ṣedakah*-story is seductive enough. It would account, among other things, for the disappearance of all scriptural support, although another, equally suitable, text²⁷ was easily available. Also the epilogue וחיזו קראין אותה משפחת ריב"ז על שמו of the *Babli* version can be explained in terms of the purpose for which it was made. *SE*, *Midr. Sam.*, and *Gen. R.* are edifying stories meant to exhort the audience or reading public to practise charity. b. *R.H.*, on the other hand, is no sermon; it is meant as proof. It is advanced as empirical evidence in order to settle an argument. This is quite in keeping with the concentrated, condensed style and, above all, with the addition of the vital evidential information²⁸ והלכו ועסקו בתורה. The implied argument is: if you do not believe this, then just look at that flourishing family with the remarkable name! Unless the

25 R. Meir v. R. Yohanan; Mamlā v. Jerusalem; the request "pray for us" v. a more general cry for help ומה עלינו לעשות; different proof-texts.

26 Charity in *Midr. Sam.*, *Gen. R.*, and *SE*; study of *Thorah* in b. *R.H.*

27 E.g., *Prov.* iii, 18, which is often used for this purpose.

28 Also given by *SE*: והלכו ועשו כן וכו'.

opponent can produce an equally good "ætiological myth," the family-name has settled the argument.

The Talmudic version thus shows marks of having been artificially produced. The *SE* version, though an ostensible parallel, agrees in most respects both materially and formally with the R. Meir story. On the other hand, the R. Meir story has a precision and density of style which bring it closer to b. *R.H.* than to *SE*. E.g., the pattern of the sage's advice is similar in the three texts:

<i>Midr. Sam.</i>	התעסקו בצדקה
<i>Gen. R.</i>	לכו ושפלו בצדקה
b. <i>R.H.</i>	לכו ועסקו בתורה

The *SE* belongs to a different pattern. It appears therefore that both b. *R.H.* and *S.E.* depend on a more primitive R. Yohanan story which was probably similar to the one told of R. Meir. In b. *R.H.* the story was changed to satisfy a different ideal, in *SE* the story was merely expanded in accordance with the more verbose and rhetorical style of its author.

Ad 5. The range of the homily is now widened by introducing the synonym *mishpat*. The odd ומקיים נפשות רבות (as if one life saved was not enough) may already be an anticipation of the later reference to Ps. xxxiii, 5, with its "world-wide" character²⁹ or else it comes as an aftermath to the aforementioned נמצא מקיים את ת"ה. *Ps.* 55, 19, is at last explicitly put into God's mouth and the homily thus comes back full circle to its beginning, i.e., to the text given in b. *Ber.* 8a. Here, however, the divine statement is about עושה צדקה ומשפט alone and ignores both the עוסק בתורה and the מתפלל עם הציבור (viz., the מצוי בבית הכנסת of Alfassi's and *Yalkut's* readings). The obscure ומוציא followed by a lacuna in Friedmann's MS. suggests a possible corruption from some phrase using the scriptural idiom הוצא משפט. The wording of *SE* is diffuse as usual in comparison with the parallel versions. The divine statement is qualified in b. *Ber.* 8a מעלה אני עליך כאילו פדאני לי ולבני מבין א"ה"ע (*Yalkut Jb.* 36: (כאילו פדאו) whereas *SE* reads אמר הקב"ה מי פדה אותו במקום שכינתו ופורה את ישראל מבין אה"ע. In the other versions the traditional belief in God's presence with Israel in its exile, and in the divine assumption of a common fate, is expressed with delicate simplicity. God, i.e., his *shekinah* is together with Israel בין אומות העולם. *SE*, enlarging as always, wants to redeem God

²⁹ Stressed by b. *Sukkah* 49b.

ממקום שכינתו and Israel מבין אומות העולם, although the two are (or should be) identical.³⁰

Ad 6. The next midrash is faintly reminiscent of b. *Sukkah* 119b, though the scriptural text, *Ps.* xxxv, 5, is used differently. The similarity and thence association-value seems to reside in the phrase עושה צדקה ומשפט occurring there and heralded already by our author's wording of the previous section. The pattern is the usual one of בזמן שישראל עושין — בזמן שאין ישראל עושין.³¹ What happens if Israel lacks *ṣedakah* and *mishpat* is described, so we are told, *Is.* lix, 15, וירא ה' וירע בעיניו כי אין משפט. The key-word has changed by now to *mishpat* alone. Starting off from *ṣedakah*, and proceeding via *ṣedakah u-mishpat*, we have finished up with *mishpat*. This key-word is also the formal link to the following section³² and its proof-text, *Jer.* xxi, 12, which mentions *mishpat* as hastening the advent of the Messiah, exactly like *ṣedakah* in section 5. The material link is provided by the motif of the redemption of Israel מבין אוה"ע in the previous section and the similar expectation of *ge'ullah* and *yemoth hamashiah* by the בית דוד. Again we find a seemingly straightforward pericope in *SE* to be a rather complex series of simpler aggadic units joined together according to certain laws of association.

R. J. ZWI WERBLOWSKY.

Manchester.

³⁰ HAJDA tries to iron this out by reading מי פדה אותי ואת שכינתי ואת ישראל מבין ואת אוה"ע but even so either אוה"ע or שכינתי is redundant.

³¹ Cf. b. *Ber.* 35b, *B.B.* 25b and passim.

³² Omitting section 7; cf. n. 16.



THE MYSTICAL DOCTRINE OF RABBI 'OBADYAH, GRANDSON OF MOSES MAIMONIDES

The Judæo-Arabic manuscript Oriental 661 of the Bodleian Library at Oxford contains¹ documents transcribed by a copyist who certainly had a guiding idea in forming his collection. Indeed, the works which he set himself to reproduce are inspired, in different ways, by that current of mystical neoplatonism which attracted so many minds, at once religious and given to metaphysical speculation, among the adepts of the revealed religions of the Middle Ages. We find in it, besides the pamphlet which we shall consider here, the exhortation to the soul which is attributed sometimes to Hermes, sometimes to Plato and even to Aristotle,² as well as the works of Judah ben Nissim Ibn Malka.³

The first document, with which we are now concerned, unfortunately lacks its beginning; the first two folios of the MS being lost, our work now covers folios 3 to 27b. We thus lack the preface, and it is only the information supplied by the copyist which gives an indication of the title and the presumed name of the author.

תמת אלמקאלת (!) אלהוציה אלמנסובה לר' עבדיה ב"ר אברהם
החסיד ז"ל ב' רבינו משה הנאון ב"ר מימון זצ"ל.

"Here endeth the dissertation of the *Bowl* attributed to Rabbi 'Obadyah, son of Rabbi Abraham the Pious, son of our Master Moses . . . son of Maimon."

The title is a strange one, and, in the absence of the lost preface, its meaning⁴ is made clear only by a passage which we shall examine in due course.

¹ Number 2389 of NEUBAUER's Catalogue. It is as well to correct on two points what I have written in connection with this manuscript in my *Judah ben Nissim* (see below), p. 7: the writing is oriental and the water-mark of the paper (balance in a circle, related to Briquet No. 2445) suggests for the copy the limiting dates of 1450-1530.

² Fol. 28-54. The identification was made by MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER, *MGWJ* 45, 1901, 133, n. 1, (cf. *ZDMG* 47, 1893, 342 and 368). This copy, which H. L. FLEISCHER and O. BARDENHEWER could not have known, was not used either by Mr. ABDURRAHMAN BADAWI in his recent republication of the text (*Neoplatonici apud Arabes*, Cairo, 1955, pp. 53-116). According to the colophon, the text is supposed to form part of the "Platonic writings" (*aṣ-ṣuḥuf al-aflāḥiyya*). It should be noted that the majority of the MSS. preserved are by the hand of Christian copyists.

³ *Judah ben Nissim Ibn Malka, philosophe juif marocain* (Collection Hesperis XV), Paris, Larose, 1954.

⁴ Judging from the little he says of it, STEINSCHNEIDER can hardly have done more than skim the text (see *MGWJ* quoted above and *ALJ*, § 161, p. 225) and NEUBAUER must have done the same. E. STRAUSS, *Toldoth ha-yehūdīm be-Miṣrayīm we-Sūriyāh* 1, 1944, 169, and R. MARGALIT, *Rabbenū Abraham ben ha-RMBM, Sefer Milhamoth ha-Shem* 1953, 39, depend on STEINSCHNEIDER; their references merely add to the confusion.

The author has no hesitation in returning to the ideas which lie close to his heart. He states them in particular in his conclusion (*khatm* fol. 24-25b) and in his final exhortation (*tanbīh* fol. 26b-28), which to a certain extent makes up for the loss of the exordium and, unless we are mistaken, furnishes the reader with all the essentials of the doctrine.

So far as I am aware, there is no explicit indication that confirms the attribution of the *Maqāla al-ḥawḍiyya* to 'Obadyah Maimonides⁵ any more than there exists a reason against it. Until proof to the contrary is adduced, we may therefore place our trust in the tradition which is echoed by the scribe.

The nature of the treatise is very clearly apparent: we have here an introduction to the spiritual life or, if you prefer, a guide to perfection. In spite of the poverty of his style and a few contradictions which are, moreover, inherent in his subject, the author expounds his doctrine with sufficient clarity and precision.

The goal of spiritual progression is a kind of union with God. The technical term which denotes this state, as well as the doctrinal context where the word appears, are obviously derived from the *Guide to the Perplexed*, not, however, without undergoing characteristic modifications.

"Reason is the bond between God and his creatures": *al-'aql huwa l-wuṣṣla bayna l-bārī wabayna makhlūqātih*.⁶ Moses Maimonides had expressed himself in almost the same terms in chapter 51 of part three of the *Guide*, where he linked together love of God and supreme intellectual perfection, which in their turn bring about the uninterrupted action of special providence in favour of members of the rare elite who have attained to this high state.⁷ We shall nevertheless see that, however much he may be influenced by his grandfather's philosophic mysticism, R. Obadyah lives in a spiritual climate that is alien to the intellectualism of the *Guide*. Borrowing of terminology and verbal similarities must not therefore distract us from the real trend of the treatise.

Man is, in principle, capable of achieving his sublime destiny. Does he not embody in himself the whole universe? Is he not "the

⁵ 1228-1265: *ALJ*, passage quoted.

⁶ Fol. 3b; cf. 21a.

⁷ 125a of the Arabic text, p. 439 of the French translation of SALOMON MUNK. The whole of the "annotation" (*tanbīh*) should be re-read. SAMUEL IBN TIBBON has rendered the Arabic term by *dibbūq*. See also I. EFROS, *Philosophical Terms in the Moreh Nebukim*, 23 and the Appendix.

elite of this lower world" (*ṣafwat al-‘ālam as-suflī*) and attached by his reason to the higher world?⁸

Nevertheless, the goal is hard to attain, for man is not a pure spirit; the association of the soul with matter, although the latter is not in itself bad, forms an obstacle to perfection.⁹

It is true that man, or rather the believer, has a means which greatly assists him in travelling the road at the end of which eternal bliss awaits him. This means is the knowledge of the Torah. The revealed laws, of which our author chooses to stress the spiritual value, constitute a kind of preparation or propædæutic for ethics just as, according to the philosophers, mathematics is a preparation for physics and the latter for metaphysics.

"Know, my son, that reason forms the bond between God and thyself. The food which nourishes it is the science of the unalterable things; without these it is unable to subsist or to maintain itself. Just as the body cannot subsist except by the healthy food that suits it, so reason is only maintained by the true sciences, whose permanency guarantees its own (?). But (for) him who studies the sciences whose meaning he is ignorant of, (the object of his study) so to speak lacks consistency and serves no useful purpose either in this world or in the next (. . .). As for us, God has made us a gift of the Law, perfect in itself and giving perfection, that Law which we now possess. It lends us mastery over our moral qualities as well as intellectual vigour, for sound reason (*al-‘aql as-sālim*) is the perfect Law and the divine Law is sound reason."

This perfect doctrine is taught to those who satisfy the conditions of age and character required by the Rabbis.¹⁰

Matter, we have said, is not in itself bad; it is only its associa-

⁸ Fol. 6b seq. 11a-12b. These views are part of themes very common in philosophical popularisation; see, for instance, G. VAJDA in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 17, 1949, 112-114. Moses Maimonides had less peremptory ideas as to man's place in the universe: see *Guide* I, 72, Munk, pp. 369-371 and III, 13, Munk, pp. 88 and 96-98; cf. also I. HEINEMANN, *Die Lehre von der Zweckbestimmung des Menschen*. Breslau, 1926, 71 seq., 77 seq.

⁹ Fol. 10-11, 18b-19. The *Guide* has a perhaps less favourable opinion on the subject of matter (cf. particularly III, 8), but in the logic of the system, matter cannot be bad in so far as it is something positive, since evil is only the deprivation of something good, i.e., non-being. Indeed, the conflict between matter and mind is for our author on the same plane as in Bahya and a large number of other thinkers of the Middle Ages: the care required by the body interferes with spiritual life and deflects from the pursuit of perfection; the history of the theme is outlined in *Judah ben Nissim* . . ., 129-134.

¹⁰ Fol. 21a-b; cf. 5-6, 8 seq., 22b-23.

tion with the rational soul in the human compound that brings about fatal consequences. This mode of seeing things nevertheless remains theoretical. In practice, man has to reckon, not with an abstract concept of matter which only exists in the mind, but with an actual blend of the corporeal and the spiritual, which gives rise to sin in many circumstances of private and social life. While it is true that in the process of attaining spiritual perfection, it is as well to advance slowly and cautiously, imitating nature whose actions are accomplished unhurriedly, in reality a constant struggle has to be conducted with the "inclination" which diverts us from salutary action and seeks to hurl us into the abyss of corporeal delights. The quest for perfection tends to impose a separation from the everyday and to turn one aside from all the affairs of the world which are calculated to cause the "breaking of the bond" (*qaṭ' al-wuṣṣla*) between God and his worshipper. The latter will thus come to proclaim with the ascetic of the Talmud: "let the world depend on others" and will formulate his exclusive love of God in the words of the Song of Songs: "I belong to my Lover and desire Him only."¹¹

R. 'Obadyah does not stop at these generalities. In a number of passages he gives a wealth of practical instructions which lay down the general doctrine while giving it finer shades and rendering it flexible on certain points.

Strict control of sleep and diet, discretion in speech and the practice, on which the author lays great stress, of silence, renunciation of the superfluous, humility and modesty with one's neighbour, such are the rules of life which he advocates, in full agreement, let it be said, with all the philosophers and the spiritual writers of Judaism as of the other faiths of the Middle Ages.¹²

Isolation, withdrawal into solitude, is a method eminently favourable to the practice of serving God which is, as one knows, "service (or worship) of the heart" (*'ibāda qalbiyya*).¹³ No less vital is the importance of properly directed intention (*niyya*, i.e.,

¹¹ Fol. 5-6, 10-11, 17-19.

¹² Fol. 15-16, 19-21 and the final exhortation fol. 26b-28.

¹³ All this is still inspired by *Guide* III, 51 (especially Munk pp. 437-438), less the intellectualism; it is characteristic that Moses Maimonides speaks of *'ibāda 'aqliyya* "intellectual service (or worship)" (*ibid.*, 126a final line of Arabic text, Munk, p. 442).

kawwanah) in prayer¹⁴ and of the spiritual reading of the Scriptures.¹⁵

Our author is nevertheless fully aware that the ascetic ideal of solitude is not entirely assimilable by authentic Judaism.¹⁶ The Jew has certain pressing duties to perform in society, in particular that of procreation. The Patriarchs, those models of spiritual perfection, were careful to meet that obligation, but only after attaining to the required degree of saintliness; this explains why Isaac and Jacob only took wives at an advanced age.¹⁷

All these rules of conduct presuppose the liberty of man. R. 'Obadyah recognises this and emphasises very strongly that spiritual perfection can only be the result of personal effort and never the outcome of the passive acceptance of a rule.¹⁸ Man is only worthy of his name, he is only "really a man" (*insān 'alā l-ḥaqīqa*) if he has fully acquired the virtues.¹⁹ It is only then that he is worthy of being called "lover of God" or "God-fearing," like Abraham and David.²⁰ It is only then that he is the object of individual providence, which frees the righteous man from the sway of chance

¹⁴ Fol. 15-16 (this is moreover why silence is particularly recommended), 26-28: "The service of the heart" says 'Obadyah in his final parenthesis, is much neglected in our century, even by the spiritual leaders of the people, so that the words uttered in their prayers contradict their inner attitude. What hypocrisy to recite: "God breaks enemies and humbles hardened sinners," while the speaker is one of them; to proclaim "happy the people whose god is the Lord" while he is in a state of transgression!

¹⁵ Fol. 23-24. A thorough knowledge of the Scriptures will enable the reader of this treatise to locate the texts which correspond to the doctrine expounded here, which in turn will aid him to a still more penetrating scriptural meditation. The same applies to the words of the Sages: "If thou wilt understand their allegories, consider attentively their words" (*idhā aradta an tafhama alghāzham fata'ammal kalāmahum*). For *alghāz* cf. also fol. 16-17b: doctrine of a spiritual nature is hard to assimilate; it is therefore important to understand allegories (like the "small city" of Ecclesiastes). If necessary they must be studied with an expert master, and in a general way it is as well to receive the truth from whosoever utters it.

¹⁶ Fol. 14. "Do not believe, like the poor of spirit, that a result is obtained by leading a hermit's life on the mountains and in the caverns; it is not so."

¹⁷ Fol. 14-15. This is borrowed, doubtless with other concrete rules of conduct, from the *Kifāyat al-ābidin* of Abraham Maimonides; see *The High Ways of Perfection*, ed. S. ROSENBLATT II, 264. Note the expression, very Mohammedan in flavour, used to denote the true ascetics: *al-muḥaqqiqūn min ahl ḥādhihi ṭ-ṭariq*.

¹⁸ Fol. 6b sq.; cf. 4b-5. In the matter of routine conformism (*taqlid*), see *Guide* III, 51, 123b-124a (Munk, p. 435) and Bahya, *Hidāya* ed. YAHUDA, pp. 15-17, with our commentary, *La Théologie Ascétique de Bahya Ibn Paqūda*, Paris, 1947, 18, n. 1.

¹⁹ Fol. 4b. The expression recalls *Guide* III, 8 (13a line 18) *an takūna insānan ḥaqiqatan*.

²⁰ Fol. 18. The Arabic text uses Hebrew terms: *oheb, hosheq, yāre'*. See also the conclusion, fol. 25, to which we shall revert, and 12a-b in which are quoted Deut. vi, 5 and Cant. viii, 6; it is also stated there that the great zeal displayed by David to prepare the construction of the Temple testifies to his extreme love of God (*nihāya fi l-maḥabba*).

and liberates him from the domination of the stars. Such was, for instance, the situation of Jacob, named Israel, *i.e.*, "victorious fighter"; he was snatched from the domination of chance, and it is in this sense that our Doctors said: "There is no star for Israel," *viz.*, for the true Israelites; indeed, reason forms the bond between the Creator and his creatures; he who aspires to God and makes God his goal, in the sense of David's words: "I always set the Lord before me; upheld by Him I shall not stumble," such a man God will protect from adversity by the emanation that proceeds from Him, as it is said: "for he has loved me with passion and I have saved him."²¹

Our author continues with this exhortation to his reader:

"Seek ardently this degree and spend all thy time (in acquiring it), as it is proclaimed by the Sage: "If a man should give his whole fortune for love, no account would be taken of him."

There is more to it than this. Other privileges of a still higher order are conferred on the mystic who, with complete self-mastery, turns his back on the affairs of this lower world and communes uninterruptedly with God: the gates of the invisible open to him and the forces of nature submit to his behests.

"When thou remainest alone with thy soul after mastering thy moral qualities (= thy passions), a gate will open before thee through which thou wilt contemplate wonders. Indeed, with the suppression of thy five outward senses thy inner senses will awaken and thou wilt be shown a dazzling light (flashing) with the light of the Intellect. Thou wilt perceive powerful, mighty, terrifying voices which entrance a man out of his senses (. . .). It is on account of this (experience) that a hierarchy is established among the itinerant (mystics) of this way, for it is in accordance with the manner in which the individual governs his soul when he drinks, eats, sleeps, thinks (in short), in all his activities that he will behave at the moment of his state" (??).²²

And a little further on:

"When thou wilt have persevered in this effort (of purification of the heart and reduction of secular occupations to those strictly necessary), thy imaginative faculty will be purified, and everything

²¹ All of this passage again (fol. 3b-4) feeds on the doctrine of *Guide* III 51. In connection with the breaking away from what is ordained in the stars in favour of the righteous, see the data, by no way exhaustive collected in *Juda ben Nissim*, 110-121.

²² Fol. 12b. The reading and sense of the last phase remain uncertain.

that is graven on the *well-guarded tablet* will be manifested to thee. Thy words will reveal the hidden things for thy mind will be occupied with this object of research.²³ (Having reached this state) *watch with all thy strength the residue remaining in the Bowl*²⁴; see that no impurity finds its way in with the water poured into it, for if anything remains there the imaginative faculty will restore it to thee during sleep, or when awake, at the moment of solitary meditation; thou wilt think that it is a contribution from without while it is a residue contained in the *Bowl*."

This fallacious residue, R. 'Obadyah continues, is "the water" whose name, according to the Rabbis, should not be uttered at the moment of ecstatic experience.²⁵

The passage which we have just translated is particularly valuable for it provides us, unless we are mistaken, with the explanation of the unusual title of our treatise.²⁶

The "Bowl" symbolises the human compound which is open to good and bad influences. The troubled waters, *i.e.*, the vetiges of corporeity, impair the purity of the soul, obtained at the cost of a long and arduous asceticism, and may give rise to pernicious illusions in the conscience of the mystic steeped in the effluvia of the supernatural world.

While meditating on the high ideal of spirituality which he proposes, R. 'Obadyah does not under-estimate the serious difficulties that lie in wait for not only the progressing disciple, but also, and perhaps still more so, for the mystic already admitted to the intimacy of the Beloved, "above all when his aspiration for this thing (union) is constant. Then no profane intent separates him from it (. . .); he is attached only to his Beloved and clings only to the skirt of his garment (. . .). Now it is a very difficult matter. I mean that one of us, a being of darkness, made of gross matter, clings to a luminous, absolutely simple substance. What state will

23 From the mind inclined towards union with God ecstatic revelations will issue forth spontaneously.

24 *Waḥtariz bikulli jahdika min fadlatin tabqā fi l-hawḍ.*

25 Allusion to the well-known passage in the Talmud, *Hagigah* 14b; cf. G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends* . . . , 2nd ed. 52, 361 and A. NÉHER, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, July-September, 1951, 59-82 (see *ibid.*, January-March, 1955, 77).

26 It is perhaps not unnecessary to mention here that there exists in Moham-medan mystical literature an "epistle of the Bowl" (*ar-risāla al-hawdiyya*), whose author is the celebrated Sufi 'Alī ash-Shādhilī, a contemporary (593/1196-656/1258) of our 'Obadyah. I unfortunately lack information about the contents of this epistle, a single manuscript of which has been reported, in the municipal library of Alexandria; see C. BROCKELMANN, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur*, 2nd ed. I, 584 (*Supplement* III, 1235).

be his ? If he remains in the proximity (of the Beloved) he wastes away, if he departs from it he dies."²⁷

The lover who is worthy of the name²⁸ is a prey to lover's folly and persists the more surely in that condition the more he is attached to the object of his love. He withdraws to the wilderness and is right in so doing ; did not God subject our forefathers to this form of life following the exodus from Egypt ? The Patriarchs preferred the country to the towns, Jeremiah aspired to such a retreat and Elijah above all led the life of a hermit. It is nevertheless a fact that, even in the past, few were capable of living wholly in accordance with this ideal, barely a single individual in each generation²⁹ : after Jacob the bond (*wuṣla*) was broken until Moses restored it.³⁰

These observations show adequately that we are powerless to establish and maintain by our own efforts communion with God. The aspirant to perfection must have recourse to a mediator, and intercessor (*shafī*).

"It is clear that he who has no intercessor to tie the bond between himself and his Beloved, *is considered as dead*."³¹

It is true that the feeling of our powerlessness and the compulsory recourse to intercession do not dispense us from ourselves imploring the divine mercy. The spiritual efficacy of the intercessor bears no comparison, however, with that of our personal efforts, since the former operates in favour of the dead as well and contributes greatly to the redemption of Israel and to the restoration of the Temple.

In the analysis just made, we have assembled and emphasised, taking care always not to distort, the elements which we believe

²⁷ Fol. 4-5. The quotation should be replaced in its context, analysed above, notes 19-20. The attitude of man should be twofold as regards spiritual perfection and adhesion to God : to confess his powerlessness at the same time as stretching his personal effort to the utmost.

²⁸ See above note 20. The whole of the development that follows : fol. 25a-b.

²⁹ We readily discern in all this the threefold influence of Bahya, Moses, and Abraham Maimonides. If this development conflicts with that, already studied, which denies spiritual value to the hermit's life, it must be remembered that for Bahya too, the perfection attained in Biblical times by a chosen few was not renewable at the will of the contemporary ascetic. Abraham Maimonides thought the same, and went still further, for he recognised in certain aspects of Mohammedan mysticism an achievement of the ascetic ideal, of which he deemed his own coreligionists to be rather incapable.

³⁰ *Wuṣla* therefore performs in this view a function similar to, and perhaps identical with, that of *amr ilāhi* in Judah Halevi. On this page, our author probably also recalled the *Sefer ha-Mūsar* of Joseph ben Judah Ibn 'Aqnin, (ed. W. BACHER, Berlin, 1910, 81). He, like the latter, mentions the famous sentence of *Sukkah* 45b : *rā'iti bene 'aliyāh wehen mu'aṭin*.

³¹ *Hāshūb kemet*, in Hebrew in the Arabic text.

to be the essentials of the mystical doctrine of R. 'Obadyah Maimonides. A philological and historical commentary, which should accompany the publication, much to be desired, of the text and its translation into a widely understood European tongue, would easily show the dependence of our author on the theological and spiritual works of his forerunners. We will add nothing here to the parallels made in the foregoing. Do not let us forget that the borrowed doctrines, and even the formulæ may radically change their meaning at the will of the tendencies, inclinations and understanding of the borrower. Furthermore, the choice made by the latter from among the materials at his disposal is what sheds most light on his turn of mind, and is as important, if not more so, than the bare fact of literary and ideological relationships.

The "bond" has not the same meaning with 'Obadyah as with his grandfather, from whom nevertheless he borrowed the word and, almost literally, its definition. Verbally again, spiritual perfection is of an essentially intellectual order in his teaching, as in that of the *Guide*, but this "intellectualism" no longer has anything of the philosophic about it: it is the data of the written Torah and the oral Torah that feed the activity of the reason. The concept of the perfect man according to 'Obadyah has definite forerunners in Bahya, Judah Halevi and Moses Maimonides, but here it takes on a rather special hue owing to the fact that the "righteous man" enjoys pneumatic and thaumaturgic privileges that are far more marked than in those authors. We might be put in mind of Mohammedan philosophical influences, as for instance, the portrait of the Perfect One outlined by Ibn Sīnā in the last pages of the *Ishārāt*,³² or mystical influences from the same quarter. It would, moreover, be very rash to make a decision before the *Kifāyat al-'ābidīn* of Abraham Maimonides is completely accessible.

The most striking feature of the doctrine of R. 'Obadyah is unquestionably the renunciation, after a painful discussion, of conquest and above all of the personal retention of the mystical union, with the obligation arising therefrom, of recourse to that somewhat enigmatical "intercessor" or spiritual director, who is even more a quasi-Messianic figure.³³ I am unable to say whether

³² The fragments that have been preserved in the Genizah testify that this book was read by the Jews of Egypt, like many other mystico-philosophical Islamic texts.

³³ This latter characteristic is of some importance being the only one whereby the collective aspect of mysticism is introduced into a composition which is otherwise only concerned with individual salvation.

previous Jewish mysticism, of no matter what tendency, affords an exact or even an approximate parallel.

It has been possible to find pneumatic tendencies in Moses Maimonides, as well as in his son.³⁴ The concept of indispensable spiritual mediation nevertheless seems alien to them.

In Sufism, the spiritual master is sometimes termed a "road leading to God"; and even for the ancient Mohammedan tradition, it is not inconceivable that, besides the Prophet, holy individuals intercede in favour of the faithful.³⁵ Here again, however, there is actually no question of a mediation that would form permanently a bridge as it were between God and the man seeking him.³⁶ It is therefore wise, until fuller information becomes available, to leave the question in abeyance³⁷ and to interpret psychologically the doctrine of 'Obadyah on this point, as the result of the tension maintained in the mystic's soul by the desire for God and the feeling of his own unworthiness and weakness.

It should be recalled in conclusion that R. 'Obadyah is by no means the last mystic author in the Arabic language within Syro-Egyptian Jewish circles. Two manuscripts in the Bodleian (Pococke 223 and Huntington 489, Neubauer Nos. 1313 and 1314) contain parts of a vast philosophico-mystical compilation in Judæo-Arabic. This work, which quotes both the *Sēfer ha-Bāhīr* and our R. 'Obadyah (Hunt. 489 fol. 148) calls for close study and at least partial publication. Further texts³⁸ will probably not fail to be added

³⁴ See the highly suggestive, although not always convincing, study by A. HESCHEL: *ההאמן הרמב"ם שוכח לנבואה* in Louis Ginzberg Jubilee volume, Hebrew part 159-188.

³⁵ See A. J. WENSINCK, *The Muslim Creed*, Cambridge, 1932, 180, n. 3. The *Kitāb at-ta'arruf of Kalābādhi*, the classic manual of Sufism, has a chapter on intercession, only the commencement of which relates to his problem, without moreover, in any way going beyond the data customary to the most common professions of faith. (*The Doctrine of the Sufis*, trans., A. J. ARBERRY, Cambridge, 1935, 39-40).

³⁶ Moses is, of course, a mediator and intercessor even according to the Bible (Deut. v, 5; Jer. xv, 1, etc.), as well as according to the rabbis. Contemplation of his case has without any doubt encouraged the blossoming of the idea with which we are concerned here. Only, the Moses of the Bible and of rabbinic tradition is the transmitter of the revealed Law and not a master of mysticism for the initiated, nor a messianic figure, unless by remote anticipation.

³⁷ A search through Arabic mystic literature, which I have no leisure to undertake at present, might reveal some surprises. It may also be stated that at the present time, the need for a spiritual director or, more correctly, a regular connection with a chain of initiation, is a postulate of Sufism. However, neither this idea nor the terminology expressing it appear in the *Maqāla ḥawdiyya*. Finally, the function of universal intercessor which popular Sufism even today assigns to its saints is something quite different from that which we have here.

³⁸ MR. FRANZ ROSENTHAL has studied a work of this kind, likewise preserved at Oxford: *A Judæo-Arabic Work under Sufic Influence*, in *HUCA* 15, 1940, 433-484. I think that he makes it too recent by dating it in the sixteenth century.

to what is already superficially known in a very neglected domain of the history of Jewish spirituality.

GEORGES VAJDA.

Paris.

APPENDIX

Wuṣṣla

Munk has very correctly translated *al-'aql alladhi fāda 'alaynā minhu ta 'ālā huwa l-wuṣṣla allatī baynanā wabaynahū* by "cet intellect qui s'épanche sur nous de la part de Dieu est le lieu qui existe entre nous et lui." It is in fact a question, in the Maimonides context (cf. also 124b, lines 19-20, trans. p. 437), of characterising the overflowing intellect as the intermediary between man and God, from the ontological point of view, but still more (since the distance between man and God cannot be spanned), as an instrument, an active instrument provided it is maintained, for achieving this constant being-with-God. This is for Maimonides the summit of spiritual existence, mystical union if you like. But it is not this state which is, strictly speaking, rendered by the word *wuṣṣla*; the latter does not mean, therefore, "(mystical) union." In Obadyah, on the contrary, the reproduction of Maimonides' phraseology covers, it would seem, a shift in meaning; *wuṣṣla* tends to become the term for the actual state of being joined, *i.e.*, practically the equivalent of *debēqūth* in the mystic of Hebraic expression. The fact is that *wuṣṣla* is not the word employed in the terminology either of philosophy or of actual mysticism in Mohammedan Arabic; nor is it, unless I am mistaken, used by Judæo-Arabic theologians to render the notion of union with God; they use, with different shades of meaning, other derivatives of the same root: *wuṣūl* (constantly in Abraham Maimonides), *waṣl* or *wuṣl*, *wiṣāl*, *ittiṣāl*; on the other hand, as Mr. Bernard Lewis has reminded me, *wuṣṣla* (*vuslat* in modern spelling) is very much used in the poetico-mystic vocabulary of the Turks. It should moreover be noted that *wuṣṣla* is attested in Arabic texts which, without originally being either Mohammedan or Jewish, were readily copied and read by both: in the *Liber de Castigatione animæ* (which figures, as we

have said, in the MS. on which this study is based) and in the *Liber de Causis*. In the former text it is to be found twice: In chapter 3 (Badawi, *Neoplatonici* 66, 6) as a synonym of *ribāṭ*, *rābiṭa*, i.e., in the sense of "joint, bond, intermediate link," but with a more precise meaning: the branch is derived from the root and the fruit from the tree. While it is true that the two terms are remote, a bond is tied between them thanks to which the derivative receives its sustenance from the root, while with this bond done away with, it perishes. Moreover, the text stresses the organic character of the bond, by describing the relationship of the two terms as *ittiṣāl dhāfī* ("essential junction"). What is significant here is that the author wishes to make it understood by these images that there is a relationship between the individual soul and universal Reason. The second text figures in chapter 12 (Badawi 102 pu.), where reference is made to the virtue of the patience required to carry out any intent and particularly to achieve the Good. A certain co-operation is needed between the subject who goes in quest of the object and the object itself. In the case in question, the man in quest of the Good and of happiness, the respective operations are: patience on the part of the man and spiritual assistance (*tawfiq*) on the part of Good. "When the act proceeding from the subject is attached to that which proceeds from the object, the bond (*wuṣla*) is necessarily established and the connection (*inḍiyāf*) is completed." The point of view is not the same in the two texts, but *wuṣla* certainly has a certain mystical connotation in both.

In the *de Causis*, we find *wuṣla* first of all in a context which concerns the question of separation, of removal, which weakens the action of the higher on the lower: when the subject acts directly on the object, without there being between them a "join or other intermediary" (*wuṣla*, *shay'ākhar mutawassit*), the action is imperfect (chap. 19 Badawi, *op. laud.* 21, 8 sqq. cf. the recension of 'Abdallaṭīf Baghdādī *ibid.*, 251, 15 sqq.). We have here an example of the ambivalence of the bond: it unites, but by interposing itself, therefore by separating. Only the recension of 'Abdallaṭīf, unless I am mistaken, attests another use of *wuṣla* (253, 4); time is the bond and the intermediary between eternal substances and substances subjected to it and therefore perishable.

Finally, to come back to a text contained in our actual manuscript, but later than those with which we have so far been dealing, Judah ben Nissim speaks of the bond (*wuṣla*) between man and

the sphere ; he means thereby the three faculties of the *pneuma*, viz., imagination, reflection, and memory, which play a part in the production and preservation of intellectual love as that author understands it ; they unite in this way the human individual with the intelligible energies which are, in his system, the influxes from the astral world (cf. *Judah ben Nissim* 40-41).

These few notes taken from reading do not, of course, claim to constitute the history of the term *wuṣṣla* ; they are merely intended to furnish some data for one of the articles of the technical lexicon of philosophy and mysticism in the Arabic language, which remains a task for the future.

G. VAJDA.

Paris.

WHICH IS THE OLDEST WOODCUT HAGGADAH ?*

Until the year 1940 the Prague Haggadah 1526 was considered the oldest printed woodcut Haggadah. In that year the late eminent scholar and bibliophile Lazarus Goldschmidt published a booklet *The earliest illustrated Haggadah*, in which he claimed the discovery of a fragment of an undated Haggadah which, according to him, was published probably in 1522 by Gershom Cohen with the assistance of the artist Chayim Schwarz, the same men who later printed the Haggadah of 1526.

Although Goldschmidt enumerates a number of reasons for his assumption, he does not succeed in destroying the suspicion that his fervent love of incunabula and early prints may have led him to overestimate the value of the discovery which he had made.

According to Goldschmidt's description, the undated copy is entirely devoid of catchwords (p. 21); "the whole ornamentation of the initials is much more simple, one might almost say more crude and less developed than in the well-known edition" (pp. 8f.). The oldest edition has four pages less than the edition of 1526, and has no textborder. The composition is poor, compared with that of 1526; the commentary is partly printed in the so-called Rashitypes¹ and partly in merubba, whilst in the 1526² edition all the types are

* I wish to acknowledge with much gratitude the valuable help and advice I have received from Professor BERNHARD BERENSON, Florence; Dr. R. EDELMANN, Librarian, Royal Library, Copenhagen; Mr. O. H. LEHMANN, M.A., Bodleian Library, Oxford; Mr. J. LEEVEN, B.A., Keeper, British Museum, London; and Miss ELIZABETH RENDALL, M.A., London.

¹ According to R. EDELMANN, Librarian of the Bibliotheca Judaica Simonseniana, Royal Library, Copenhagen, these types begin on the page which commences with *אלו קרבנו לפני דר סיני*

² GOLDSCHMIDT severely criticises v. SCHLOSSER and KARL SCHWARZ as well as H. LOEWE (p. 13, n. 1, and p. 51), who, together with BENZION KATZ, published in 1925 a Facsimile edition of Prague 1526, with an introduction under the title *Die Pessach Haggadah des Gerschom Kohen 5287/1527*. According to the colophon of Prague the Haggadah was accomplished on Sunday, 26th Tebeth of the Jewish year 5287, identical with Sunday, 30th December, 1526, of the Christian era. The editor's statement, as well as H. LOEWE's remark on p. 6, that Haggadah Prague was printed at the turn of the years 1526/27, must be rectified accordingly. This error obviously misled such a conscientious scholar as R. WISCHNITZER-BERNSTEIN to write in vol. 7 of the *Encyclopædia Judaica*, p. 810, s.v. *Haggadah*, that Haggadah Prague was printed in 1526/27; illustr. No. 19 there shows the same erroneous date 1527. According to H. LOEWE (*ibid.*, p. 6), a reprint of Prague 1526 of lesser beauty was published in 1550. GOLDSCHMIDT correctly remarks that such an edition never existed, but continues (p. 14): "he (v. SCHLOSSER) could only have thought of the 1556 or 1590 editions, which, however, are not reprints of Gershom Cohen's Haggadah at all; they are completely different editions of different size, with different types and different woodcuts such as appeared later in Prague and other places by the dozen." Here GOLDSCHMIDT is not quite correct as far as the edition of 1556 is concerned. Although he is right with regard to the size and types, he is mistaken in what

merubba (p. 22). The woodcut on p. 17a is placed in such a way that the vowels of the last line had to be omitted. Goldschmidt assumes that the earliest edition never contained "any ceremonial directions, neither Kiddush nor the various blessings" (p. 23); it contained "nothing but the liturgy of the Seder-evening." On p. 44 he writes that the letters are small and some of them not in good condition. Here Goldschmidt particularly mentions the "ד" which obviously was faulty throughout.

The first quire and almost the whole of the second quire, *i.e.*, pp. 1-6 and 8-13, are missing (p. 41). In the copy itself "the marginal annotation is entirely missing; so is Grace after meal, the translation of אָדיר הוּא in Yiddish-German" and also the colophon at the end which should give the name of the printer and the place and year of publication.^{2a} The "surviving copy" is therefore a mere fragment; it nevertheless was, according to Goldschmidt, "bound very early" (p. 25) with the first quire and with leaves replaced from the second edition of 1526. Perhaps the most surprising part of this argument is Goldschmidt's statement (p. 24) that not only "the ceremonial directions" but also "Kiddush and the blessings are additions which do not properly belong to the Haggadah and were only inserted later." There is scarcely any written or printed Haggadah of which these items are not considered indispensable parts.

Further, Goldschmidt contradicts himself. On p. 8 he writes of his amazement at finding that the defective copy he bought represented "an entirely new edition . . . which, apart from the first few leaves, differs completely from the Prague Haggadah as I knew it." But on the following page he goes on to say that, although he found that the composition of the type was different, "the individual

Continued from previous page

he says of the woodcuts. Of the 31 woodcuts in the edition of 1556, twenty-eight are identical with those in the edition of 1526. Only three are different, namely, the ornamental p. 3a, the poorly clad child with bare feet which asks "mah nishtana" on p. 3b, and the figure of R. Elieser on p. 4a, represented as a reading man, repeated p. 9b. As to the ornamental page 3a, it shows a gateway; on top of it there is a figure of Moses with the tablets; underneath the text of בְּרָא לְחַמָּה עֵינָא. On the one side a winged angel with a jug in his hand, on the other side a shield with the star of David. The bottom of the page shows two lions holding armorial bearings. It is therefore most probable that 1550 in v. SCHLOSSER's treatise was a misprint and should read 1556.

^{2a} GOLDSCHMIDT tries to minimise this deficiency by the ingenuous statement that "the earliest edition" does not contain the "interesting epilogue of Gershom Cohen" (p. 9).

types themselves, the contents of each page, and the number of lines do not differ in the two editions."

As to the woodcuts, Goldschmidt assumes (p. 42) that the woodcut on p. 28a, which represents King David with the harp, is signed with a **ש**, the initial of the artist Chayim Schwarz, because it is the final illustration. But actually there are two more woodcuts on pp. 29b and 31a. His opinion is that the woodcut on p. 29b "does not count as one of the series of marginal woodcuts," but this is not very convincing. Goldschmidt adds that for the same reason (*i.e.*, because King David in his opinion is the concluding woodcut) the Mantua Haggadah is also signed.^{2b} But this is not confirmed by the copies of 1560 and 1568 in the British Museum and the Bodleian.

At the beginning of his booklet (p. 7) Goldschmidt reports that he possessed a copy of the Prague Haggadah 1526 in "very good condition," apart from p. 8, which was missing. But his copy must have had other deficiencies as well because the woodcuts on pp. 7a, 13b, 16a, 17a, and 20b "appear coarse and worn" (p. 11, note). This is not confirmed by the copies of the British Museum and the Bodleian.

Finally, whilst the edition of 1526 has the name of the printer, Gershom Cohen, with the emblem of the blessing hands once only, on p. 3b, the name of the printer and the emblem are to be found twice in the Goldschmidt Haggadah, namely, on p. 3b, above the words **כהא לחמא** and on p. 25a, above **שפוך חמתך**. Both pages there have the same border. This is not the case in the edition of 1526, where the borders on p. 3b and p. 25a are different. This means that the allegedly earliest illustrated Haggadah has no page with the illustrations of Adam and Eve, Samson with the gate, Judith with the head of Holofernes, the two sitting men with the Bohemian coat of arms, and the "**ש**".

In spite of the deficiencies and oddities of the copy, Goldschmidt holds that it represents "the oldest illustrated Haggadah, the oldest German print altogether" (p. 25). He himself is mystified by the fact that not a trace of this "early print" is to be found in the whole of literature. He tries to solve the riddle by suggesting "that

^{2b} GOLDSCHMIDT's remark (p. 42) that the signature in "Latin characters tails away into decorative flourishes" is also not confirmed by the copies of the Brit. Museum and the Bodleian.

perhaps the whole edition, or at least part of it, was destroyed, thereby necessitating the printing of a new edition."

Now "the oldest German print," i.e., the oldest Hebrew print in Germany, was made already in 1512.³ Goldschmidt himself quotes this fact on p. 26. Since he assumes that the earliest illustrated Haggadah probably was printed ten years later, one is surprised that the joy of his discovery should have led this expert in bibliography to such an exaggeration. One may also query Goldschmidt's assertion (p. 25) that in the copy in his possession the first quire and almost the whole of the second quire, replaced from the 1526 edition, were bound at a very early date together with the leaves of the "earliest illustrated Haggadah." What proofs can there be that this binding took place very early? Who can tell whether it was not executed in modern times, and whether L. Goldschmidt in his zeal as collector of rare books has not become the victim of the deceit?

The real question is how to explain the existence of leaves originating from the printing-house of Gershom Cohen in Prague. A possible answer is that they were trial leaves for the edition of 1526. We know that already 50 years earlier Hebrew books had been printed in Italy⁴ and that very soon the art of printing had developed to great height in Italy, Spain, and Portugal.

It is against this background that we should view the venture of Solomon Cohen, the father of Gershom Cohen, the editor of Prague 1526, who opened a printing-house there in 1512. Today we know of about 150⁵ Hebrew incunabula on subjects of the greatest variety, such as Bible, Talmud, legal codes, commentaries, and particularly prayer-books. But never before had a Pesach Haggadah been printed. The publication of this, the most popular book after the Torah and prayer-book, must have seemed particularly attractive. But great as the enticement may have been, no less great were the difficulties and therefore the financial risk included. The difficulties were not only technical. The task was to make a selection out of the abundance of motifs suggested by the story of the Exodus as related in the Bible and interpreted by

³ Mr. O. M. LEHMANN, of the Bodleian, who kindly read this essay in manuscript, remarks that there were actually two places where, in 1512, Hebrew books were printed: the Prague Tephillah and Th. Murner's *ברכת המזון ליהודים* Frankfurt/M.

⁴ Cf. A. FREIMANN. *Thesaurus Typographiae Hebraicae saeculi XV*, 1924ff.

⁵ A. MARX. "Literatur ueber Hebraeische Inkunabeln," *Soncino-Blaetter*, I, 1925-26, p. 167, n. 1.

Jewish tradition, as well as by the ritual of the Seder night. The subject had been treated by Jewish artists in manuscripts as well as by Christian artists in their illustrations of Biblical themes, and all this vast material had to be sifted and examined for its artistic value and for its attractiveness to the taste of the Jewish public. It is to the credit of Gershom Cohen and his helpers, among them Chayim Schwarz, that their selection of motifs shows a refined taste in artistic treatment as well as in composition. The Haggadah Prague 1526, with its woodcuts and particularly its two full-size illustrated pages, is among the best and most renowned representatives of the illustrated Pesach Haggadah.

On the technical side the editors must have faced difficulties similar to those of their Christian and Jewish predecessors more than half a century before. What is more natural than that, to avoid a financial loss and other disappointments, they chose the same means used from the very beginning of the art of printing and kept for special editions until today, that of making a few single trial leaves?

Alfred W. Pollard,⁶ writing of the renowned very first print, that of the Bible completed in summer 1456 in Mainz, says that "the interesting trial leaves, preserved in some copies of the 42-line Bible, differ from the rest not only in having their text compressed into two lines less, but also in having the rubrics printed instead of filled in by hand . . ." And K. Haebler⁷ writes: "Der Druck von einzelnen Seiten ist jedenfalls das Urspruengliche gewesen . . . , es ist anzunehmen, dass der Druck von einzelnen Seiten noch viel laenger in der Uebung gewesen ist, als uns die alten Drucke . . . verraten." According to the description Goldschmidt gives of the "earliest illustrated Haggadah," these trial leaves seem to have begun with the printing of the Hebrew letters only, since he speaks of "the only Hebrew woodcut print" (p. 18, n. 3). These letters were, as stated before, primitive and partly defective (p. 44). There were also deficiencies in composition, but this was improved in the edition of 1526. The aforementioned lack of Grace in the middle and of a colophon at the end is easily explained if we assume that

⁶ *Early illustrated books*, London, 1893.

⁷ *Handbuch der Inkunabelkunde*, Leipzig, 1925, p. 65. The printing of single pages is confirmed by L. GOLDSCHMIDT himself. On page 40 of *The Earliest Illustrated Haggadah* he writes: "Normally a page of text consists of 13 lines, . . . The few exceptions are probably miscalculations of the compositor, since, as was frequently the case among printers of the time, the sheets were not set and printed one after another, but in no particular order at all. . . ."

the leaves discovered were only made for trial. If they were really intended to form part of a proper Haggadah, which would have been the first ever printed, it is inconceivable that the printers should have missed the opportunity of stating in a colophon the time and place of the print as well as the name of the printer.

Additional evidence for the making of trial leaves is afforded by the two identical illustrations in the Goldschmidt Haggadah on the page with **כַּחַא לַחמָא** and on that with **שְׁפוּךְ חֲמֶתֶךְ**. It seems very unlikely that Gershom Cohen would have used his own name with the emblem of the blessing hands twice. And in view of the magnificently decorated incunabula published in Italy, Spain, and Portugal, the use of the same border for the only full-size decorated pages of the first illustrated Haggadah printed in Germany appears most improbable. But if these pages were merely trial leaves, we can understand that the printer decided to use the one woodcut for the first full-size page 3b⁸ and to make another woodcut for the page with **שְׁפוּךְ חֲמֶתֶךְ**, as is to be seen in the edition of 1526 on p. 25a.

There are a few other passages in L. Goldschmidt's book that need correction—quite apart from the ill-tempered tone of his attacks on authors who had dealt with the Haggadah before him. Thus, when v. Schlosser, the co-editor of the renowned *Die Haggadah von Sarajevo*, is condemned for his "mistakes and blunders" (p. 15),⁹ it should be remembered that this admirable book, a pioneer in its field, has become the standard work to which all later research in the Passover Haggadah has to refer.

In 1920 Karl Schwarz published two booklets on the Prague Haggadah 1526 and the Mantua Haggadah 1568. Describing the

⁸ LOEWE is mistaken when on the full-size illustrated page 3b he interprets the standing figure on the right as our ancestor, Jacob, and that on the left as Esau. The correct explanation as David and Goliath was already given by Mueller and v. Schlosser in *Die Haggadah von Sarajevo*, Vienna, 1898. Loewe wrongly considers the man riding upon an ass to be the prophet Elijah (*ibid.*, p. 13). But according to *Zec.* ix, 9, the rider should be identified as the Messiah.

⁹ GOLDSCHMIDT rebukes v. SCHLOSSER because in describing the Mantua Haggadah of the year 1560, he had in front of him "the entirely different edition" of the year 1568. . . . This statement is not quite correct. Apart from the fact that Goldschmidt himself at the end of the book on p. 42 (in the note) writes about the edition of 1568 "executed a little differently," namely from that of 1560, there are many similarities. There are, for instance, the same woodcuts for the following subjects: A man searching for the leaven, the scene of baking the matzah, the hunting of the hare, the celebrant with a crown on his head and the cup in his hand, the family at the Seder table with the side pictures, the arrival of the guest outside the door and the maid in the kitchen, the illustration of the four sons, and the arrival of the Messiah with the prophet Elijah blowing the shofar in front of the Temple.

latter, Schwarz thinks that a certain picture of the Passover meal originates from a Christian example of the Marriage of "Kanaan." This unfortunate blunder, "Kanaan" instead of "Kana," not only caused Goldschmidt's fierce wrath, but also provoked an energetic denial that any Christian influences were to be found in the illustration of the Passover meal: "The picture is copied exactly from the Prague edition and shows here even more distinctly than in that one a typically Jewish festive table, or to be more precise, a Seder evening, Jewish faces, Jewish costumes, Jewish candelabra hanging from the ceiling, and a table laid with Matzah. . . ."

Goldschmidt's assertion that the picture in the Mantua Haggadah is an *exact* copy of the Prague Haggadah is unfounded. The only similarity is the "Jewish candelabrum" hanging from the ceiling. Otherwise the differences are striking. In Prague there are five persons: the celebrant, two guests, the housewife, and a child sitting at the Seder table. The Mantua Haggadah has only three sitting and one person standing with a jug and a basin in his hand. The two side pictures are missing in Prague as well.

As to Schwarz's reference to a Christian picture of the Marriage of Kana, Goldschmidt ironically asks: "Why should an artist from Prague or Vienna find it necessary to take owls to Athens?" Goldschmidt probably misunderstood Schwarz's remark. The Mantua Haggadahs of 1560 and 1568 contain another picture, showing a festive room with two candelabras hanging from the ceiling. About ten people sit at the Seder table upon which different kinds of food, particularly Matzah, are to be seen. Through the open door servants with dishes in their hands are coming in. It was probably this picture with its vivid contents, reproduced twice in the Mantua ed. of 1568 (pp. 6a and 22b), but once only in the Mantua edd. of 1560 (p. 23a), which Schwarz had in mind. There were obviously already at the time of the publication of the Haggadah doubts as to the meaning of the illustration, because it is accompanied in Mantua 1568 by two verses, each of two lines, which try to explain the intention of the artist. One reads:

צורת משאי פרפראות הסעודה באחרית
חתלמידים הבאים על קשי של שחרית

and the other:

צורת המשמש חכמים הנדולים
מסבים בבני ברק ועוסקים בפלפולים

The first verse obviously describes the people crowding the entrance as servants carrying dishes and the pupils announcing the

time of the morning prayer. The second verse dwells partly upon the servants and partly upon the sages discussing the events of Passover. It is noteworthy that the illustrated Haggadah of Amsterdam 1695, second edition 1712, with its well-known picture of the sages, gathered in Bne Brak, is not easy to understand either. Instead of showing the sages studying and discussing religious problems, they are seen eating and drinking, whilst servants are carrying dishes with food and filling goblets. R. Wischnitzer-Bernstein rightly points out that this scene is a reproduction of Matthias Merian's picture "Joseph entertaining his brethren." As our picture in the Mantua Haggadah suggests a similar Christian source, I approached the eminent authority in this field, Mr. Bernhard Berenson, Florence. In a written reply he kindly made the following comment: "... The composition is so strictly traditional that it is difficult to say from whom the artist received his inspiration. The group sitting at the table reminds of very early compositions of the trecento, whilst the group on the right appears strongly Venetian and could originate from Bonifazio Veronese. This would also agree with the date of the Haggadah."

It should further be mentioned that Goldschmidt, after having mentioned Schwarz's publication of pictures of Mantua 1568 (p. 16), obviously forgetting this, writes on p. 18, note 3: "The historian of art, Karl Schwarz . . . wrote a little booklet about the 'Mantuaner Haggadah,' . . . in which he notices 'the close resemblance of the Prague prototype' in the harehunt reproduced on p. 6, which is 'almost in the same form.'" Goldschmidt goes on: "He fails to realise that it is a recut true to the original to the last detail, including all the misprints." Here again Goldschmidt is mistaken. The harehunt in Mantua is obviously influenced by the Prague example, but the pictures are definitely different. In the Prague edition there are two hares and three hounds, the third one beside the hunter, who is blowing a long horn, his feet in stirrups. The Mantua Haggadah has only two hares and three hounds; the horn of the hunter is much smaller and he has no stirrups at all; the hat, too, is different. But there is in Mantua a small bridge which in Prague is missing. Further, whilst the hunter in Prague is on the left and the hounds running to the right, everything in Mantua is in the opposite direction. Finally, there is a gate in Mantua which is not to be found in Prague.

Goldschmidt also blames v. Schlosser because he refers to a

border in Mantua 1560, "which even the 1568 edition does not contain." In fact the copy of the British Museum Mantua 1560 contains this border. He further writes on p. 15 that "the earlier one (Mantua 1560) has only an ornamental border round the text apart from the small woodcuts," whereas the later one (Mantua 1568) has a Hebrew commentary in the same place. Here it should be said that in spite of the commentary which runs only to p. 18a, there are many woodcuts in Mantua 1568. This consists of 36 leaves, whilst 1560 has 38 leaves. In 1568 Grace and colophon are missing.

BRUNO ITALIENER.

(We regret to announce the sudden death of the author after this article had gone to press.)

LONDON YIDDISH LETTERS OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (II)

A. INTRODUCTION

(Continued from page 165, Volume VI, No. 3)

Here only a few examples:

	<i>Dutch</i>	<i>English</i>
אינפלאגירן	implogieren	to employ
פר פרונקן	verpronken	to waste money on fineries
פר הויזט	verhuisd	removed
פאר זיך איך	verzoch ik	I request
פר הנדלט	verhandeld	sold,
בהנדגן	behandigan	to hand over,
אין שולד גישטאקן	gestoken	to run into debt
א פינטיה	a pintje (diminutive)	pint
פרעדיקאציע	predikatii (Germ. Predigt)	Sermon
דיט	duit (Germ. Deut.)	smallest coin, a farthing
לסין	lappen	remnants of material
לפני, בעד	Here we have the influence of Dutch in the use of the Hebrew word, meaning: voor etc.	for

In Dutch Yiddish we can also notice the characteristic mark of Western Yiddish whereby the mediaeval German diphthongs *ai*, *ou* and *öü*, become: *aa*. So for inst. in:

. . פראנד, קאפין, נטיק, אניקליק . .
while in Eastern Yiddish they are:

. . פריינד, קויפין, נייטיק, אייניקלעק . .

We also find in the texts varying spellings, but some misspellings of Hebrew words are particularly worth while noting. They make perhaps no pretence of being phonetic:

דאגות,	—	דאגית
זעדינו,	—	זעדינה
מענדלה	—	מינדלה (male name)

No. 2	אמאנה,	(אמונה)
	שיגאן,	(שגעון)
	משונה	(משוגע)

No. 5	שטארטאק בילת נמים,	(שטרות קבלת נאמים)
-------	--------------------	--------------------

No. 6

שאר,ה

(שרה)

שביאמם,

the seven days
of mourning)

מראה,

(מערכה)

No. 7

סיפרם,

(ספרים)

Here are some other misspellings:

instead of:

השגחה,	—	השגחה
שדוכים,	—	שדוכים
משפחה,	—	מישפכה
טיקף,	—	טיקף
אפשר,	—	עפשר
תשובה,	—	לשובה
יתרו,	—	יתרה
כ"ח.	—	ק"ח (date)

It may also be worthwhile noting the following Hebrew expressions which show clearly the influence of the spoken vernacular:

.. דבר . .	meaning: I shall always
	take something
	for my writing.
אני אעמוד לו בנתיים,	„ I shall be your
	intermediary.
אבל כדי הי (ה) להיות ליתן ..	„ it would have
	been worth while
	to give.

8. *Final note.*

I am publishing the letters in their original version (avoiding any transcription) in order to give the Yiddish philologist the possibility of studying the material in its original form and drawing his own conclusions. My remarks can only pretend to be of a general nature. Furthermore, owing to the limited space at my disposal I have had to reduce my introductory notes considerably, but hope to return to the subject at some future date. Finally, I would like to acknowledge with thanks the ready help and useful suggestions which I have gratefully received from Dr. Solomon A. Birnbaum of London and Mr. H. Beem in Leeuwarden (Holland).

B. TEXT

No. 1 (4)

LONDON TO DUBLIN

From: Jehudah Leib,
To: Rabbi Aaron the Scribe.

י' (ם) ג' י"ג שבט תס"ג (1703) פה לונדון בס"ד.

מטה אהרן יפרח. כששן ופרח. ואורו יזרח, כצאת השמש ממזרח. ה"ה אהו' האלוף המרומם. מיליו כושל מקומם. יצוה ה' עליו חסדו יומם. כ"ש כהר"ר אהרן יצ"ו. ר"ד י"א. שנית מהודענן, דו הבתולה הנה מיר גויון האט גי"ה, דו מעכ"ת איר גוטר פראנד איז אונ' מעכ"ב ראט איר לשדך את עצמה עם כמ' משה בן כמ' פייבש. בכן מהודענן, דו הבתולה הנה האט מגלה דעתה לפני גוועזן, דו זיא וויל זיך סומך זיין אויף מעכ", דו זיא בטוח איז אן מעכ" דו ווערט ניט ח'י' איין יתומה און פירן¹¹ וועגן הונאות שדכנות וועגן. בכן ווערט מעכ" וויטער דאש בעשט טאן און לידי גמר ברענגן. בזה האופן, דו זיא אים זאל מסלק זיין לנדן שלשים לטרות שטערלינג. אך ורק ווייל מעכ" ניט במעלט¹² אויב כמר משה וויל לכאן קומין גומר צו זיין, וגם אויב וויל בכאן קובע דירתו זיין, אדר באשר הוא שם בדובלין אונ' וווגו זאל אצלו קומין. ע"כ האט זיא נאך ניט כח ורשות גשיקט ביז זיא נאך אמאל חשובה מן מעכ" האט. בכן בקשתי שטוחה ופרוסה מלפני מעלתו, דו דאך מעכט איין פראנד זיין להבתולח הני"ל¹³. דען האט שם טוב בקהילה, דו איז מעכטיג גבירתיזות¹⁴ אונ' חכמה וגם ווישן, ניט אנדרשט כל בני הקהילה איר ניט אנדרשט, אז כל טוב נאך צו זאגין כל ימי היותה בכאן. בכן על תשובתו הרמה אצפה. ואם מה' יצא הדבר¹⁵ אונ' הבעל דבר וועט ניט וועלן לכאן קומין, ווערט זיא כח ורשות למעכ" שיקן. ובאם ווען ווערט לכאן קומין, ווערט זיא בטחון¹⁶ שיקן דו ווערט אויף גווישן דרך לכאן קומין. בזה אצא בט"ש¹⁷ מאה¹⁸ ומנאי אה' נאמנו יהודא ליב מליסא ולע"ע¹⁹ בלונדון. הבתולה הני"ל¹³ פורס' (ת) בשלומו ובשלום זוגתו וכב"ב²⁰ וכל הדורשים בשלומכם.

¹ with the help of God. Letters were started with this formula or : (בע"ה) בעזרת השם.

² הלא הוא.

³ כבוד שמו.

⁴ כבוד הרב רבי.

⁵ ישמרהו צורו וגואלו.

⁶ ראשית דבר.

⁷ יברכהו אלהים.

⁸ גלילות ידו הקדושה.

⁹ מעלת כבוד תורתו.

¹⁰ חם ושלום.

¹¹ To mislead.

¹² (Middle High German =) MHG.: To inform.

¹³ הנזכר(ת)לעיל.

¹⁴ Yidd. נביר, a rich man; נבירטע, a rich woman.

¹⁵ Quotation from Gen. 24, 50.

¹⁶ A deposit.

¹⁷ בטוב שלום.

¹⁸ Word not clear. Perhaps: מאהבה, affectionate.

¹⁹ ולעת עתה.

²⁰ וכל בני ביתו.

ואחר כתבא דנא בא אלי הנ"ל אנו' גואגט, דז דעתה נוטה ווער, דז הבחור משה מעכט דאך לכאן קומין, דז ער פאר¹ ויא זעהט אנו' זיא אים. דא קאן מן קנס ליגן בכאן. אנו' מיד י"ד ימי' (ם) אחר זה החתונה מאכין. מחמת שדכנות זאל דאך מעכ' ניקש בנומק' זיין. ושת³ מיהודא לייב הנ"ל. וגם וועגן נדן מעכט געכר^{3a} מער זיין אז ל' לטרות אז וועניגער. וגם מלבושים ה' פק אנו' ווייש צייג הכל לרוב.

On the back page:

לק"ק דובלין.

יושג.

ויותן אל משכיל כאיתן. מתון מתון,⁴
האלוף המרומם כהר"ר אהרן סופר שי.
וחל"ב⁵.

In English: This for Moses Aaron in Dublin (several words crossed and unreadable) in Ireland.

No. 2 (3)

AMSTERDAM TO LONDON

From: Jehudah ben Isaac, כ"ץ

To: Rabbi Aaron the Scribe.

ד' שבט תע"ג לפ"ק.

אקרא לשלו' (ם) לאהובי מחותני האלוף והמרומם כהר"ר אהרן יצ"ר וכאל"ש⁸. ר"ד י"א¹⁰. שנית אודע למכ"ת, דז איך זיין כתב האב מקבל גוועזן, האב מיך זער משמיה גוועזן. אייאר גווגד פרהאף צו הש"י¹¹ דעגלייכן צו הערן לאי"א¹² אין עושר וכבוד.

מחמת דז הומש, האב תיכף מיט כמר מאיר גרעט; האט מיר אך דען ועלבגן טאג תשובה גואגט. דער פארטגיז האט גפאדרט נ' זהובים ריווח, האט אים גואגט, קומט אים נישט דרוף אן ואז ער פרקויפן זאל. מאיר האט אים גואגט, ער האט עש פרלאזן¹³ פאר ה' זהובי'. האט מישב גוועזן, ער ווייש נישט דערפון ווייל ער איין מאל גואגט האט, וייל ער אך געבן פר לה זהובי' ריווח. נון קען זיך מכ"ת נאך ריכטן¹⁴. איך דענק, איז עש אזוי פיל ווערט, איז עש דיא ה' זהובי' (ם) אך

¹ Before.

² Not to worry?

³ A greeting formula: ושלום תורתו "Peace to your learning."

^{3a} sooner.

⁴ patient, calm. Talmudical expression denoting the learned man. Comp. Berachot, 20a.

⁵ בנדוי הרם שמתא=בנהשדר"ג, often used in abbreviation: והרם לזרים בנדוי. It is the prohibition introduced by Rabbenu Gershom b. Judah "The Light of the Exile" (appr. 960-1040) against opening letters addressed to other people on pain of excommunication.

⁶ כבוד הרב רבי.

⁷ ישמרתו צורו וגואלו.

⁸ וכל אשר לו שלום.

⁹ ראשית דבר.

¹⁰ ישמרתו אלהים.

¹¹ השם יתברך.

¹² לאורך ימים אמן.

¹³ MHG.: To leave.

¹⁴ Act accordingly.

ווערט, דז מ'ט וואו פרדינן קען דראן. מ'ט האט מיך גיט צו בעטן איין שליחת פר אים צו טאן. ביין עש שלדיג צו טאן, בפרט איר טוט מיר פריינטשאפט, דז איר אויף מיין בלימכה שתי' השגחה האט. מי יתן אז מיין יכולת ווער גוועזן, העט אייך דז מעות אויז גליגט דר פאר. אונ' דז מ'ט זאל³ קיין דאגות הבן פר מיין בלימכה אונ' זיא גונד איז. אונ' אוב זיא אן איין ערליך הויז איז וועלט גערין ווישן. ווארם אז זיא פר הויזט איז פון יוסף לוי^{4a} אונ' וואש איר שכירת איז, אוב זיא עש פר בשרט⁵ האט. ווערט מוחל זיין אונ' איר זאגן, איך לאז זיא בעטן זיא זאל איר געלט צו ראט הלטן אונ' גיט פר פרונקן⁶. וויל איר מיט גלעגנהייט ג' כתנות שיקן, דז איך לאז פר איר מכן. מיין בריינכה האט אן קיין הייאר⁷ גיט, איז אונז אן קיין פארטל⁸. מי יתן, דז אן לונדן מעכט איין גוטה הייאר האבן, וועלט זיא היין שיקן. מ'ט וועט מוחל זיין אן בלימכה זאגן, ווען זיא איין הייאר וואש⁹ פר איר קרוב ליזר, זאל זיא עש צו ווישן טאן רייכלה אשת ר' איציק כחן ע'ה. וואט¹⁰ מ'ט בעטן, דז איר דז געלט מעכט שיקן, דז איר חייב זייט.

ובזה אסיים. שוב תקבל ברכה ושלום מאדון העולם, ממני מחותנך יהודא בר יצחק כץ ז"ל. מ'ט ווערט גבעטן זיין, ווערט מיר כל דבר שורש שרייבן מחמת מיין בלימכה. אונ' דז מ'ט שרייבט דז חותנו ר' שמשן אן לונדן איז, אונ' האט ל' ליטר¹¹ (ות) מיט גבראכט, איז מיר זער ליב. השי' זאל געבן, עש זאל אלפים דרוש ווערן.

גריסט מיינט וועגן רייכלה שתי' וגם חתנו ידידי' (ה) ואשתו וכב'¹¹. גם חתנו ר' שמשן אונ' לאה אונ' משה, גם בתי בלימכה שתי'. מיין סלאווה אונ מיין בריינכה לאזן אייך בכלל גריסן. חמי וחמותי לאזן אייך אן גריסן.

On the other side of the letter there is the address and postscript :

מחמת מיין מעמד איז שלעכט, איז לגנר גיט צו פרדינן כאן. וואש⁹ גיט וואו איך בגינ¹² זאל, וויל איך צום גייטיגסטן העט טאן¹³ אן ניקש צו דינ¹⁴. השי' זאל אויש קומשט¹⁵ געבן. מיין בריינכה העט אן גרושן זין דער צו אן ענגלנד צו ציהן, כאן איז גיט וואל צו דינן. דז רוב האלט קיין מיידן וויל אזו שלעכטי צייט איז. דער האט פלעגן צוויי מיידן צו הלטן, האלט נון איינע; אונ' דר שכירת איז אן גיט גרוש, דז זיא צו ניקש קומען קען. אלז דען וועלט מ'ט גבעטן האבן, ווען איירא לייט איין גוט הייאר פר איר וויש, זעלט מיר מודעה (!) זיין. גיט אז זיא ח'ו¹⁶ צו אייאר לאשטן זעלט היין קומן. איז טאפרה¹⁷ מייד, זיא קאן וואל וואו טאן אונ' קאן אן לינה געהן¹⁸.

¹ The word is defect. I suggest: ביין = I am

² Faulty spelling: השגחה correct: השגחה.

³ Above the line there is a word which is difficult to decipher.

⁴ Dutch: Verhuisd = removed.

^{4a} It is in all probability the same rich Hamburg jeweller, Joseph Levy, whom Roth (*The Great Synagogue*, p. 27) describes as a patron of Jewish learning and himself a scholar. For his children he had the erudite Simcha Bunim of Pinczow in Poland as a resident tutor.

⁵ Improved.

⁶ Dutch: Verpronken, to waste one's money in buying finery.

⁷ Engl. hire, as a domestic servant.

⁸ advantage.

⁹ knows, ווייס.

¹⁰ Should be: וואלט.

¹¹ וכל בני ביתו.

¹² To begin, to start.

¹³ Text faulty.

¹⁴ To earn.

¹⁵ Germ.: Auskommen, income.

¹⁶ חס. ושלום.

¹⁷ hardworking.

¹⁸ Knows needlework.

גם מוז' מכת' איין חידש¹ שרייבן. פון פרנקפורט זיין כתבים קומן, דו אין באמבערג האט איין גלח איין פרעדיקאציע² גמאכט, אויף איר אמאנה³, דו קיין ממש איז אן תלה⁴ אונ' איז קיין בעשרה אמנה, אז דיא יידשה אמנה. מן האט אים גפראגט אוב ער עש רעט אויז שיגאן⁵, האט ער מישב גוועזן: איר זייט משונה⁶ אז איר אן אזו איינעם גלויבט, דער ניקש קאן פועל זיין אונ' האט ניקש פועל גוועזן. ער וויל עש בווייזן. האבין זיא אים אלי פינגר אב גהאקט אונ' האבן אים לעבנדיג פאר ברענט. זאל איין גרוש רמואר⁷ זיין אונטער דען המענט.

addressed:

לק"ק לונדן.
ליד אהר' (בי) אר"א⁸ מחותני היקר והנעלה, יעלה עד למעלה, האלוף והמרומים (!), כהר"ר⁹ אהרן יצ"ו¹⁰.

להבריב¹¹.

מק"ק אמסטרדם.

Written by a different person:

Deesen briff to bestellen an arent moesz op schoe maekers au dukx palijs¹².

tot Londen.

No. 3 (2)

ROTTERDAM TO LONDON

From: Jehudah ben Menàchem,

To: R. Aaron the Scribe.

בס"די¹. ראטרדם יו' (ם) ב' ר"ח¹⁴ אדר דהאי שעתא תע"ג לפ"ק, פה ק"ק¹⁵. אהר"ן כמשה שקול¹⁶. יודיע להבין באמרי בינה להחמיר ולהקל. בקו החכמות הכתיבה נעימה, יפה תמ"ה וברה¹⁷ בפרט וכלל. ישיש וזקן זה שקנה חכמות הרבה¹⁸ וידו בכל. ה"ה¹⁹ א"ב²⁰ האלוף והתורני כ"ש²¹ כהר"ר²² אהרן יצ"ו²³ סופר מהיר נרו יאיר. הנה לע"ע²⁴ אין לחדש שום דבר, כי טרוד אני עכשיו באזה

¹ News.

³ אמנה, the religion.

⁵ Should be: שגעון.

⁷ Dutch: rumoer=noise, clamour.

⁹ כבוד הרב רבי.

¹¹ The reading is not clear. It is probably a form of the prohibition of R. Gershon b. Judah.

¹² The Address is written in Dutch: "This letter to be delivered to Aaron Moses in Shoemaker's (Row), Duke's Place, in London."

¹³ See No. 1, note 1.

¹⁴ ראש חודש.

¹⁵ קהלה קדושה.

¹⁶ An allusion to the midrashic interpretation that Aaron was of equal import to Moses. In the rhetorical style of the time the correspondent underlines the importance of R. Aaron the scribe to whom the letter was addressed.

¹⁷ The rhetorical style employs here a sentence from the Song of Solomon, 6, 10.

¹⁸ Comp. Kid. 32a. An "Old man" is used in the sense of a "Wise man."

¹⁹ חלא הוא.

²⁰ איש בריתי.

²¹ כבוד שמו.

² Sermon.

⁴ The Crucified.

⁶ phonet., should be: משונע.

⁸ איש ירא אלהים.

¹⁰ ישמרו צורו ונזולו.

²² כבוד הרב רבי.

²³ See No. 1, note 5.

²⁴ לעת עתה.

עסק מעסקי הכתיבה מה שהוכרחתי לגמור א"ה: קודם פורים ולא יכולתי להתאפק ולהשיב לאדם חשוב באמצע כבין הפרקים, בשורה שתי"ם שהן ארבע¹ ולהודיע למעכ"תי הרמתי שקבלתי סוף שבועה (!) שעברה (!) הג' עורות רצועו' (ת) מעובדים לק"תי עם כתבו דמר, מה שנתן כבוד מעלתו שם לבני חורגי הב"ח כמר אייזק יצ"ו. אך להודיע שאחד עור הי' מנוקב הרבה, וזה הי' יותר יפה בצורות הגלאנץ² מהאחרים, והם גם בטבע יותר חזקים כמו הרצועות שמשלחים לי מאמסטרדם אבל במקח הם ממש באים לחשבון אחד. ואם כך הוא, מה יוצא לי מזו, ולהטריח לאדם גדול וחשוב כמכ"ת כשאין לי שום ריווח. כי אני יכול ליקח תמיד באמסטרדם בכל עת חמן שאני רוצה: הליטר' (א) בעד ל"ב ב"ש³. והג' עורות הי' משקלם כאן רק ב' לטור' וחצי רביעי' ובא הכל לחשבון אחת. וכמדומה לי שאדוני מכ"ת סיפר לי כאן כשהי' בביתי שהוא קונה שם עור א' בעד א' דינר ענגלש. וידעתי אני גם ידעתי שמכ"ת הוכרח עכ"פ⁴ להרויח חצי שילינג ואם יתן לי כך, אז יהי' לי ג'כ⁵ איזה רווחה וכה אעשה תדיר שאתן שילינג וחצי לפנ'י⁶ עו' (ר) א' (חד). ואני אתן למכ"ת המחיר בכסף מלא או בשוה כסף מה שידבר לעבדו ואהי' מוכן לשרתו לו ולכתוב לכ"ת כל מה שהוא רוצה. ואבטל רצוני מפני רצוני⁷ אך במקח השוה ולא במקח הזול ביותר. כי אם אני הייתי רוצה בזה⁸ לא הייתי מכניס ראשי בעול ומשא כבידה להיות מלמדי (!) ילדים. כי אדוני כבר יודיע מה עול ומשא יש למלמדי תינוקת. וגם אני רוצה לכלות עיני הרכים (!) ולכתוב דק עד מאוד בחצי שוין. אבל כך דעתי לעשות: אני אכתוב לו כל מה שהוא רוצה ואני אקח תדיר לפנ'י⁹ כתיבתי איזה דבר, הן רצועו' במקח כנ"ל או שום דבר מה שיגרום הזמן כדי להקל מעליו. או אם יתן לי מזומנים אזי אעמוד לו בנתיים¹⁰ רק בזול. יותר אני איני כותב כלום כמו שכותבו סופרים אחרים מזוחות בא' בש וחצי, או ליותר ב' בש. ותפילין בעד כ' בש או כ"ב בש עם רצועות. בזה לא רציתי להכניס הקולמס בדיו ולכתוב אפילו אות אחת.

ואודות המזוחות קטנים (!) מה שכבוד מעלתו כתב לי, יש בדעתי לכתוב י"ב לפנ'י¹¹ כמו שהוא ציוה עלי ובצד האחרת מגורה קטנה, אבל לא אוכל לכתבם הכל בפעם א' (חת) כי שכיר יום אני. אבל לפחות מהי' (ם) א"ה: עד כלות ג' שבועות בעז'ה¹² אצפה שיהיו כלים ונעשים ואשלחם תיכף לבני חורגי והוא יתנם לכ"ת. אבל כדי הי' להיות ליתן¹³ לפנ'י¹⁴ כל א' יוד בש ענגלש. כי ידוע למכ"ת שיש הרבה טורח בזה והם ממש כמו כתיבת שני מזוחות, ובפרט בכתיבה דקה כזאת. ולפני סופר אחר לא רציתי לכתוב כלום כי איני להוט אחר כתיבה דקה וקטנה כזו. אך למלאות שאלתו ובקשתו¹⁵ דמר, וגם עכ"פ¹⁶ עשה לי טובה

¹ אם ירצה השם.

² Comp. Mishnah Yoma 5, 3. Also the "Avodah" in the Machsor of the Mussaf Service on the day of Atonement.

³ למעלת כבוד תורתו.

⁴ לשם קדושת ספר תורה. The work of writing the Pentateuch was holy and had to be done with great preparation.

⁵ Lustre. The scribe saw to it that the parchment was durable and had a gloss.

⁶ lb.

⁷ 32.

⁸ ב"ש. The yidd. designation of a Dutch coin of five cent. Probably derived from Germ. Batze.

⁹ על כל פנים ¹⁰ גם כן.

¹¹ Yidd.: for.

¹² Comp. Abot 2, 4.

¹³ Yiddishism: If I would have wanted it.

¹⁴ Yiddishism: To mediate.

¹⁵ For you.

¹⁶ בעזרת השם.

¹⁷ Yiddishism: It would have been worth while to give.

¹⁸ Comp. Esther, 5, 7.

יתרון ששלח לי רצועות קודם שקיבל דמי שויו ואם הם בעיטו במקח היוקר,
 יקח כפי ערכו המגיע לסך הו' שילינג מה שחייב אני לשלם לו. ואם גם בזה אינו
 רוצה ידבר לבני חורגי והוא יכתוב לי ואתן לו רשות לשלם למכ"ת בכסף עובר
 לסוחר ו' שילינג כנ"ל ויוכל אדוני כ"ת לעשות כטוב בעיניו והברירה בידו.
 ואם אדוני רוצה ליקח כל ה"ב במקח כנ"ל ; יתן לבני חורגי גם לפני המותרות
 וחוז' רצועו' (ת) כדי להקל מעליו. וכבר שלחתי א' מזוזה ע"י בני חורגי למעכ"ת
 לראות אם טוב בעיניו לעשות כולם כך, ואם ייטב בעיניו טוב; ואם יש לו איזה
 דבר שלא כפי רצונו בזה א' מזוזה מה ששלחתי על החשבון י"ב, ידבר רק לבני
 חורגי והוא יכתוב לי או יתן לו כתב וישלח לי. ואני יושב ומצפה על תשובתו
 הרמתה (!) למלאות רצונו בכל הדברים וכפי האפשריות. ותו' אין לחדש, רק
 באתי להשתחות ארצה נגד פני גדולתו וכבוד תורתו למחול לי על כתיבתי הגרוע
 (!) ולשוני הקצוץ (!) כי במהירות גדול (!) ובטרדא יתירה כתבתי.
 נאם יהודה ב"ה מנחם זצ"ל, מלמד וספרא סת"ם פה ק"ק (ושלום לכל הנלויים
 אליו: crossed out) ושלוש לאשתו דמר עם בניו ולכל הנלויים אליו.

Outside: Sealing-wax

לק"ק לונדן.

עד מהרה ירוצו דברי אלה, למאן דקרי ותני⁵ האלוף והתורני
 הישיש והזקן זה שקנה חכמות הכתיבה, יפה ונעימה ברה
 ותמה, ספרא רבא ומהיר, נירו יאיר, כ"ש כהר"ר אהרן
 סופר יצ"ו.

בנחשדר"ג.

מק"ק ראטרדם.

No. 4 (1)

ROTTERDAM TO LONDON

From: Jehudah ben Menachem

To: R. Aaron Sofer

בס"ד ראטרדם (יום) ו' עש"ק כ"ו מנחם אב תע"ג לפ"ק. (1713).
 החיי (ם) והשלו (ם) מאדון העולם לאהו (בי) חביבי ומכירי וא"ב האלוף והתורני
 עדני ועצני¹⁰ סופר מהיר ומומחא כ"ש כהר"ר אהרן יצ"ו עם שלום וזוגתו וב"ב.
 הגה מחמת איזה מניע (!) אין לי פנאי לכתוב למכ"ת בלשון הרמה לשון קודש
 רק באתי במגילה קצרה ובלשון קלילא¹¹ להודיע למכ"ת בהיות שנפשי חשקה

¹ Yidd. : for.

² and there is no more to be said.

³ The writer apologizes for his bad and faulty writing.

⁴ בן הרב.

⁵ The talm. denotation of a learned man, the one who had "read and learned."

⁶ בנדוי חרם שכתא דרבנן גרשום. The prohibition of Rabbenu Gershom, see No. 1, note 13.

⁷ בסיעתא דשמיא, with the help of God (the Heaven).

⁸ ערב שבת קודש.

⁹ א"ש בריתי

¹⁰ according to 2 Sam. 23, 8 where the text is obscure. It would mean in this context: the mighty, the powerful mind.

¹¹ Aram. In Hebrew קל=light, humble.

בו אונ' איך זוא גאר גוט פריינד ממנו בין וועלכש איך כה"ג פר האפן וויל דו
 ער מיר ג"כ² זיין זאל, כי כמים פנים אל פנים³ וכו'. ובכן פר זוך איך ממכ"ת
 להטריח אותו בעבורי אונ' מאכן מיר קלאהר ו' עורות רצועו (ת) מעובדים
 לשמה⁴. ובני הבחור (ה) חשוב כמר אייזק יצ"ו כשיבא לשם יתן מחיר הכסף
 ליד אדוני ואח"כ⁵ יתן הרצועו (ת) לידו. ואגב שוכרני בא בתוך הכתב נזכר
 לי איזה דבר, וואו איך פון גדאכטין בין מכ"ת צו אינפלאגירן⁶ אום וואש דורך
 מיר צו פר דיין. דען בני חורג הב"ח⁷ כמר אייזק האט אונש כאן איין שידוך פאר
 גטראנן, דו שם איין אלמנה איז, דיא שרה אשת ר' איצק ז"ל, וועגן בנה כמר אייזק
 עם בתי חורגת⁸ הבתולה הענדלה שט (חיה). זוא ווערט מכ"ת זעהן וואש צו
 טאן איז אונ' מיר ע"י פאשט⁹ תשובה פר מעלדן אונ' מיר דאך צום בעשטן
 ראהטן, דען זיא איז זוא גאר איין וואקר מאטכה במעשים ובפרט ביופי (ה) שלא
 ראיתי כמות בכל קהילתינו אונ' גאר וואול קענט¹⁰, זוא דאש מיר גערן וועלטן
 זעהן זיא צו בשטאטן גאר וואול. ובאשר שאני יודע שאדוני חכם כמלאך אלקים¹¹
 ובוודאי יתן לי עצה הגונה ולא יעבור על לפני עיוור וכו'¹² ועלי אניה ראשי בזה
 הדבר¹³ וישיב לי כהגון או שלא כהגון¹⁴. ואודות הפאשט מעו (ת)¹⁵ זוא ניקש
 מעכט זיין בזה העסק לפי דעתי מכ"ת ווערט בני חורגי הפאשט מעו (ת) לידו
 ויידר בהנדק¹⁶ כשיבא לשם. פר מיינ¹⁷ אבר, דש ווען איין דרך איז, דש מכ"ת
 שדכנות ווערט פר דיין קעגן אונ' מיט זיא רידן ומה תשובה נתן (!) לו להודיע לי
 בפאשט ראשון הכל היטיב, אם יש דברים בגו ומה סך נדן שהוא רוצה, הכל היטב
 נזכר¹⁸. ובזה אסיים משום מעלי שבתא¹⁹. כ"ד²⁰ הכותב בזהירות גדול (!) יהודה
 ב"ה²¹ מנחם זצ"ל.

אשתי ובני הבח (ור) כמר אייזק לאזט מכ"ת גריסן. וע"ש²² מכ"ת דיא זאכן ווייטער
 ניט צו פר מעלדן אן אימנט²³, ווען אים ניט לפי דעתו איז אום וואש יסוד בזה
 העסק צו זיין.

At the back sealing-wax. The address written in Dutch:
 Dehen brief te bestellen aan Aron Moosis livth in Shoe makeroo²⁴
 near al gat²⁵ at London.

Added in Hebrew:

ליד האלוף והתורני כהר"ר אהרון סופר יצ"ו בלונדון. בנחר"דרג²⁶.

¹ כהאי גוונא, in the same way.

² גם כן.

³ Bibl. quotation from Prov. 27, 19: "As in water face answers to face, so the mind of man reflects the man."

⁴ The parchment for the holy scroll has to be prepared specially for the purpose.

⁵ ואחר כך.

⁶ Dutch: implogieren—to employ. The sentence reads thus: "I beg (intend) to employ Your Worship to make him earn something through me . . ."

⁷ הבחור.

⁸ Stepdaughter.

⁹ To answer by post.

¹⁰ Well learned.

¹¹ Quotation from 2 Sam. 14, 20: "But my lord has wisdom like the wisdom of the angel of God to know all things . . ."

¹² Lev. 19, 14: "Thou shalt not put a stumbling block before the blind . . ."

¹³ Lit.: I shall rely on him (in the third person).

¹⁴ Lit.: Whether it is in order or not.

¹⁵ Post charges.

¹⁶ Dutch: behandigen, to hand over.

¹⁷ Dutch: vermenen (MHG ver-meinen), to suppose.

¹⁸ Everything clear and right.

¹⁹ מעלי שבתא, the eve of Sabbath.

²⁰ כה דברי.

²¹ בן חרב.

²² ועיקר שכתתי.

²³ Not to tell to anybody, to keep it secret.

²⁴ Shoemaker Str.

²⁵ Aldgate.

²⁶ The prohibition of R. Gershom: בגדיו חרם דרבנו גרשום.

AMSTERDAM TO LONDON

From: Reichla bat Jehudah Leib,

To: R. Aaron Sofer.

The letter has no date and no place of writing is recorded. Only at the end of the letter do we find that the letter was dispatched from Amsterdam on: יום ג' פ' ויקהל No year recorded.

פיל שלו (ם) אונ' לנג לעבין זאל דיר השי' געבין, צו הנט מיינס ליבן גוט גיגור הר"ר (א) הרון יצ"ו. ר"ד זייט ווישן פון מייגן גיזונט, דעש גלייכן זאל איך הערין פון אייך צו אליר צייט אונ' שטונד.

זייט ווישן דו איך אייער בריב הב מקבל גיוועזן. הב מיך משמח גיא וועזן, דו איך הב גיהערט פון אייער גיזונט. אך הב איך פאר שטאנן אייער מייניק, אז איר מיר שרייבט פון מייגן שטאט², איך זאל אייך שיקן מייגן שטאט פון קאבלת נמנים³ גיחתמנת דאש פאר למד לט"ר⁴. דו איז מיר איין גרוש חידש פון אייך, דו איר מיר אזו עפש אן מוט⁵, דו איך זאל געבין ג' לטר' (ות) געגן למ"ד ליטר'. וועגן ער וויל פאר שרייבן הונדערט פונט אזו וויל איך אים שיקן מייגן שטאט קבלת נמנים גיחתמנת. וואש מיינט ער דו ער וויל געלט צו גריגן מיט זיין טאכטער וועגן שון מייגן זון העט גיט איין דיט⁶ אזו איז ער נאך למ"ד לטר' ווערט. מייגן זון איז ב"ה גיט בלוש⁷ אונ' קען זיין ברוט פארדינן. אונ' ער הוב זיך גיט צו שעמקן מיט זיין מישפכה⁸. איך בין רעכט ברוגן איבר אייך, דו איר מיר שרייבט דו איך זאל מער געבין אז ער⁹. איר שרייבט פון גוט אן הלטונג¹⁰. וואש פאר אן הלטונג איז דא? מיינט איר, דו איך גיט בעשר וויש וואש פאר אן הלטונג האט זיין עלשטר איידם גיהט אן זיין שווער? מייגן זון האט קיין גרוש לושט נאך אום איין שידוך צו טאן. ווייל איך הבין וויל דו ער זאל איין שידוך טאן, וויל ער גיט ווידר מיר טאן אונ' וויל מיך פאלגן, אונ' ער האט קיין לושט נאך אמסטערדם צו קומן, אזו לאז איך אים זיין ווילן. לאז ער דארט איין שידוך טאן. מעגן רעט אים היא שדוחים¹¹ מיט ה' מאת' זהו¹² (ביים)¹³. איך דינק, אז די ווא (ר) הייט איז, דיא קאשטין אום איין הער צו קומן אונ' ווידר איין היין. דו קאשט געלט, אזו דינק איך, לאז ער דארטין ווינקר נעמן אונ' לאז דארטין טאן וויא¹⁴. איין זארג האב איך, דו ער ווערט גיט מער קריגן אז אין לונדה. אין אמסטערדם גיט איר לופ¹⁵ מער אז למ"ד לטר'. וועגן ער וויל גיט טאן, אזו מעג ער שוין לאזן. יוא איך זאג אים צו, דו קיין אנדר זאל מייגן שטאט הבין אז ער. לאז מענדלע טאן וואש ער וויל. ער קען דש מעדכן אונ' זיא קען אים.

¹ מיינונג, the meaning.

² Probably: instead of.

³ Misspelled: קבלת נאמנים.

⁴ 30 Pounds (Sterling).

⁵ To expect too much of someone.

⁶ "Deit," Dutch: duit, Germ. Deut, smallest coin=farthing.

⁷ Not bare, without anything.

⁸ Correct: משפחה.

⁹ More than him, meaning the father of the other party.

¹⁰ Full maintenance.

¹¹ שדוכים.

¹² A dowry of 500 (Dutch) guilders.

¹³ Sentence not complete. Probably to supplement: וויא ער וויל, as he likes it.

¹⁴ לומט, Lump (Germ.) scoundrel, miserly person.

ווייטער הב איך ניקס מער צו שרייבן. הש"י זאל אייך פריש אונ' גזונט לאזן בלייבן, פון מיר אייער גוט גינרן. רייכלה בת א"ד: מהר"ר יהוד לייב זצ"ל. גרישט אייער פראו אונ' קינדר, גאט בהיט זיא. גרישט ידידה אונ' זיין פראו אונ' מיין אניקליך, גאט היט זיא פרא אלט ביזן.

At the end we find:

לק"ק לונדה יו (ם) ג' פ' ויקהל.
צו הנט מינים ליבן גוט גינר ר' אהרן סופר.
מק"ק אמסטרדם.

No. 6

AMSTERDAM TO THE HAGUE

From: Reichla bat Jehudah Leib,
To: her children Abraham and Zedina.

As the former letter, this one has no record of the place nor of the exact date. At the end of the letter we find that it was dispatched from Amsterdam on: יום ד' פ' מקץ

פיל שלו (ם) אונ' לנג לעבין, זאל הש"י אייך מיט איין אנדר געבן. צו הנט מיין ליבה קינדר מרת זעדינה שתי אונ' קמר³ אברהם יצ"ו. זייט ווישן מיין גזונט, דעש גלייכן זאל איך הערן פון אייך צו אלר צייט אונ' שטונד.

ווישט דו איך הב אן מענדלה אונ' אן דיר גשריבן פאר ח' יום מיט שלומה שריד¹ זיין זון, הב איך דיר אל דיא גלעגן הייט פון דיא לפין² אונ' הב דיר גשריב⁽¹⁾, דו שארהי האט גיבאטין ו' בש אונ' דער האט וועלין הבין ו' בש. האט מיר שאר⁴ גיזאגט ווער דיא לפין האט. בין איך טיקה⁵ ביא דען מן גיווען, האט שון פאר קאפט⁶ גיהט. אזו עפש בלייבט ניט לנג שטין.

גיא ביא שלומה אונ' פראג דען זון בוא⁷ ער דיין בריב גילאזין האט, וואש איך אן מענדלה גשריבן האב. דארין הב איך דיר אלדיא גלעגעהייט גשריבן פון דיא לפין אונ' פון אלם. דוא ווערשט אים גיפן אין פאטרת הח. ער ווערט דאך שביאמם¹⁰ זיין. אונ' זאג מענדלה ער זאל ניט אנדרש טאן אונ' זאל מיר שרייבן אונ' געלט שיקן, דו איך בעצלין זאל וואש איך גלענט הב פאר אים. איך דרף מיין אוגן ניט אוף היבן¹¹, זיא הבין מיך גימנט וויפיל מאל. העט איך געלט גהאט אדר עפש צו פאר זעצין, העט איך שון לאנג בצלט, וואש ער מיר שולדיק. ריד¹² איך ניט ביז דש בצלט איז. ווישט ניט וואש ער זיך גידנט. ער ברענגט אוף מיר גרושה זארג. האט ער אלץ אין גיזערט¹³ דו ער מיר דש געלט ניט שיקט, דו איך

¹ Well-wisher.

² א"ד is not clear. Perhaps corrupted from: א"א = אבי. Comp.
No. 7, note 16.

³ כמר, a title used in addressing learned men.

⁴ Shlomo Shved.

⁵ Dutch: lappen, remnants of cloth.

⁶ שרה.

⁷ תיכה.

⁸ The West. Yiddish long *a* instead of the Eastern Yidd. *oi*.

⁹ Germ.: Wo, where.

¹⁰ שביאמם = שבעה ימים, probably phonetic orthography, meaning the "Shivah," the "seven days of mourning."

¹¹ To be able to look into the face of some one.

¹² I won't talk until.

¹³ To spend.

דיא לייט בעצל וואס איך פון זיינט וועגן גלענט הא, אונ' הב מיך אין שולד גישטאקן איבר' אים? איך הב אלץ גיהאפט, דו איך ווער טשובה³ הבין און מיין בריב אונ' געלט גריגן. עפשר⁴ האט איר⁵ מיין בריב ניט מקבל גיווען. לאז מענדלה מיר טשובה⁶, לאז ער מיר שרייבן אוב ער ווערק האט⁷ אונ' אוב ער עפיש געלט לייזט. איך הב מורה (!) פאר מיין שטאט⁸ דען בער האט נאך ניט אנטפונן.

ווייטער הב איך ניקש צו שרייבן. הש' זאל אייך פריש אונ' גיזונט לאזן בלייבן, פון מיר אייער מוטר רייכלה בת לא"א מהר"ר יהוד לייב ז"ל. מיט ר' אהרון סופר ווער איך דיר שיקן איין פינטיה⁹ לבאש¹⁰ אונ' קארד מוס¹⁰ אונטר אייגנדר, דען עש איז גיזונט. איך העט דיר גערין איין פינטיה עניס¹¹ און גשיקט. ער קען עש ניט מיט נעמין. איך ווער זעהן ווען איין נדרה¹² ציען ווערט. גריש דיין מן אונ' קינדר, גאט בהיט זיא. גריש מענדלה אונ' זיין פרוא.

On the other side of the letter it is written:

ל"ק"ק הג. (Hague?)

צו הנט מיינס ליבן איידם קמר¹³ אברהם. מיין ליבה טאכטר מרת זעידנו אונ' צו הנט¹³ שתי¹³.

יו' (ם) ד' פ' מקץ. וח"ל בנחשדר¹⁴ ג'.

מק"ק אמסטרדם.

No. 7

AMSTERDAM TO LONDON

From: Reichla bat Jehudah Leib,
To: R. Aaron Sofer.

As in the former two letters, the present one has no date at the beginning. At the end, it is stated that the letter was dispatched from Amsterdam on the eve of Sabbath, יום ו' פ' יתרו.

ב"ה.

פיל שלו (ם) אונ' לגנ לעבין זאל אונ' גיזונט זאל הש' אייך געבין, צו הנט מיינס גוטן פריינט אונ' מחותין, דער פרום אונ' דער קלוגר הרר אהרון סופר ש'. זייט ווישן פון מיין גיזונט, דעש גלייכן זאל איך הערין פון אייך צו אלי צייט אונ' שטונד.

¹ Dutch: gestoken, to run into debt.

² Because of him.

³ תשובה, reply.

⁴ אפשר.

⁵ He. ער?

⁶ . . . "whether he has got any work . . ."

⁷ Text not clear. Comp. No. 5, note 2.

⁸ Dutch: pintje, diminutive of pint, about half a litre.

⁹ Reading unclear. Could also be לבאש.

¹⁰ Seems to be a Greek word for mustard. Germ. Kardamom.

¹¹ Anise.

¹² Somebody else.

¹³ The name is missing from Ms.

¹⁴ וחזק לזרים בנדרוי חרם שמתא דרבנו גרשום.

הב ניט קענן אונטערלאזן אייך איין פאר ווארט צו שרייבן, ווייל איצונדר איין גוטע גילענדייט האט זיך גטראפן, אזו פאר זיך אייך³ אן אייך פריינטליך, דו איר ניט אנדרש טאן זאלט אונ' מיר געלט שיקן פאר מיין סיפרם⁴ דען (?) דען איך הב עש גאר נטיק⁵ פון טון⁶. הב איין גנצן ווינטר ניקש פאר דינט, הב נימץ⁷ דער אום איין הלב דיט גיט אדר העלפט. איך בין און קיין קינד מין, קען ניט מין פארט⁸ אונ' טוא דאך מין אז מיין מאכט איז. גיא בייא נאכט וואכין בייא קראנגה⁹. הש"י דער זאל מיר העלפין. איך דאנק הש"י דו ער מיר מיין גוונט גיט, דו איך דו נאך טאן קען. אונ' מיין איידם¹⁰ גידינק מין ניט מיט איין בריב ניט לאז שטין מיט עפש אנדרש אז ווען איך ניט איין בלודץ טראפן¹¹ בייא אים העט. אונ' מיין אניקלך פאר געשין מיינר און. ניט איין בריב איין מאל צו שרייבן בעפרט¹² דו איך גיהערט הב, דו לייב אין די וועשט טינדיש¹³ איז גיצוגין אונ' האט מיר ניט איין בריב גישריבן אז ווען איך אים אלץ ביז גיטאן. הש"י זאל מיר בצלך, וואש איך אים גיטאן הב. וואש זאל איך טאן, איך הב אזו איין מראכה¹⁴. וועם איך גוטץ טוא, טוט מיר ביז. איך נעם פון הש"י אלץ פארליב, וואש ער מיר צו שיקט. דארום בעט איך גאר פריינטליך, דו איר ניט אנדרש טאן זאלט אונ' זאלט מיין עלנט אונ' מיין עלטר אן זעהן אונ' זאל מיר ארמה¹⁵ אלמנה מיין געלט שיקן, דען איך בינש גאר נטיק.

ווייטער הב איך אייך און דער צייט ניקש מער צו שרייבן. הש"י זאל אייך פריש אונ' גוונט לאזן בלייב (ן). פון אייער גוט גינן רייכלה בת א"א¹⁶ מהר"ר יהוד' לייב זצ"ל.

גרישט אייער ליבה פרוא אונ' אייערע קינדר, גאט בהיט זיא, בעפרט מינדלה ניט צו פאר געשין אים צו גרישין. גרישט מיר מיינה אניקלך, גאט היט זיא. איך העט זיא איין בריב גישריבן, ווייל זיא אונ' איר פאטר מיר קיין טשובה (!) שרייבן. איך אפט בריב אן זיא גישריבן אונ' הבין מיר קיין ענטפערט גישריבן אז ווען איך העט זיא אלץ ביז גטן העט¹⁷. וועלט מוחל זיין אונ' וועלט דען אין גליטן בריב אפ געבן אן מיינע מחותן¹⁸. אייער שמת'.

At the very end we find in the usual manner the address:

לק"ק לונדה.

צו הנט מיינע ליבן גוטין פריינט אונ' מחותין הר"ר אהרון סופר יצ"ו.

וחל בנחש דר"ג¹⁹.

י' (ם) ו' פ' יתרה²⁰.

מק"ק אמסטערדם.

¹ Germ. "unterlassen, to abstain from . . ."

⁵ Western Yiddish: long a.

² Misspelling: גילענדייט.

⁶ Text not clear.

³ From Dutch: verzoch ik = I request.

⁷ I have nobody.

⁴ ספרים.

⁸ Cannot get away.

⁹ קראנקע, sick people.

¹⁰ Is her son-in-law Abraham (No. 6) meant here?

¹¹ Dutch: bloed, blood. The (ן), at the end probably a phonetic orthography. The meaning: בלוד טראפן, blood-relationship (consanguinity).

¹² בפרט.

¹³ West Indies (where Jews particularly from Holland used to emigrate in those days).

¹⁴ מערכה, meaning: (bad) luck.

¹⁵ Probably pronounced "arme," poor.

¹⁶ ארוני אבי.

¹⁷ Idiomatic: . . . as if I would have done them anything wrong.

¹⁸ She also spells: מחותין. The enclosed letter has not been preserved and it is not clear to whom it was addressed and who the מחותן was.

¹⁹ Comp. No. 6, note 25.

²⁰ יתרו.

No. 8 (9)

AMSTERDAM TO LONDON

From: Moses ben Meshullam,
To: his son Feys.

יו' (ם) ד' ק"ח תשרי תע"ד (1713) No place
גאר פיל גוטיר זעליגער יאר זאלין דיר ווערין וואר אויף דיין הייפט אונ' האר,
פון נוא אן ביז הונדירט יאר.
צו הנט מיין ליבר זון היקר והמשכיל כמר פייס יצ"ו.
ניט פיל זונדרליך צו שרייבן, רק זיין ווישן פון אונזירם גיוונט, דעש זעלביגגלייכן
פאר איך צו הערין אונ' צו זעהן עד מאה שנים אמן סלה.
מיין ליבר זון, נעמט מיך גרויש וואונדיר פון דיר, דאש דוא מיר ניט שרייבשט
תשובה אויף מיין בריב, דיא איך מיט פאטיעקא גשיקט האב. אלזו ווישן מיר
ניט, וואש דאש ביטייט. נור מיר בילין זיך איין, דאש דוא ניט שרייבשט, דאש
דוא ברוגז ביזט, פון וועגן ווייל מן ניט איז גיגאנגן אונ' האט דיר גשיקט דיא
שעכט מעשירס. זוא מוז דוא ווישן, אלזו מיר קיין שולט דער צו האבן, דען אזו
באלד אלז מיר דיין כתב האבן מקבל גיוועזן, זוא זיינן מיר גיגאנגן ביא אברהם
סירוקא אונ' זוא זיינן מיר דיר זיא גיגאנגן קאפין אונ' האבן זיא גיהאט. אלזו
האבן מיר זיא וועלין מיט געבן אן דען משרת, דער דא וואונט ביא אלייריס
דעקאשטע, ער היישט מיכל אונ' האב אים גיבעטן ער זאל זיא מיט נעמן. אלזו
האט ער מיר בילויבט, ער וויל זיא מיט נעמן, נור ער האט זיך ניט פאר מיר
לאזן זעהן. ער איז וואול ח' יו' (ם) אוועק גיוועשט ער¹ מיר עש גיווישט האבן.
אונ' דוא זיינן מיר גיגאנגן אונ' האבן גיוועלט אנדריין לייטן וועלין מיט געבן,
קיינר האט זיא וועלין מיט נעמן. אלזו זיינן מיר גיגאנגן אונ' האבן זיא ווידר
פאר קאפט. אלזו האבן מיר וואול ג' זהו' (בים) דראן פור לארין אונ' זוא פור
זוכן מיר ניט(?) אנדירשט¹⁰ אונ' ווערשט אונש תשובה שרייבן אויף אונזירן בריב
דיא מאן דיר גישריבן האבן.
נוא מוזין מיר צו ווישן טאן, אלזו אונזיר טויב איז במ"ט¹¹ איין כלה גיווארדין אונ'
קנס גיליגט חול המועד פון סוכת¹² מיט לזר פון נערדיין¹³. גאט זאל אונש מזל
ברכה געבן מיט אונזיר גאנצן (פא)מיליא, אמן סלה.
ממני משה בהר"ר משולם ז"ל. דיא מעמה¹⁴ חתן אונ' כלה, טעלצקי, יטכה,
שמעי' (ה) אונ' דוד לאזן דיר זער פריינטליך גריסן. דער אונקיל שמעי' (ה),

¹ Misspelling: כ"ח.

² A biblical quot. according to 2 Sam. 3, 29: "May it fall on the head of Joab . . ."

³ To supplement the missing word: פאר האף, I hope.

⁴ Misspelled from בילון, to imagine.

⁵ או, that.

⁶ The long *a* of Western Yiddish.

⁷ Alvares Dacosta.

⁸ From Dutch "beloofd" = promised.

⁹ Before.

¹⁰ To request, meaning: We beg of you but to write.

¹¹ במזל טוב.

¹² The engagement took place during the intermediate days of Sukkot, so that the date of כ"ח תשרי indicates that the letter was written about ten days afterwards.

¹³ Town in North Holland.

¹⁴ Western Yidd. meme, mother.

יין זעליג מיט זיין פרויא לאזן דיר(?) אך פריינטליך גריסן אונ' דיין מימלה:
מיט איר קינדיר אונ' אוך גיט צו פור געשן.

On the back page in the same handwriting:

מיין ליבר ברודיר, ווערשט מיר דאך וואש היפש שיקן, דען ווער איך דיר וואול
וואש שיקן. עש איז פיר ליבשטע שוועסטיר טויב.
אונ' נעמט אונז גרויז וואונדיר אלז דוא מיט דיין מימלה גיט שרייבט אויב איר
דיא הערינג העט מקבל גיוועזט אודיר גיט. מיר פור לאנגן מיט דיא ערשטיג
תשובה.

The usual address in Hebrew:

לק"ק לונדון.
צו הנט מיין ליבר זון, היקר והמשכיל כמר פייס יצ"ו. וואונט ביא דען אלטן
ראזע ריניס אין די בערין שטריט.
וחל בנחשדרג
מאמשרדם יצ"ו.

On the same page we find the following note written by some one in English: "Given by Humfrey Wanley who bought it of a Person that took it up in the street, having seen it drop from a Gentlewoman as she passed along. The Language is Low Dutch."

From this note we can clearly deduce how sometimes a letter got lost in the street and having been picked up by a stranger was preserved for posterity. The note-writer was apparently not familiar with the Hebrew characters and therefore considered the language of the letter as Low Dutch.

No. 9 (8)

AMSTERDAM TO LONDON

From: Jehudah ben Isaak,

To: R. Aaron Sofer.

ניכתב יום א' ק"ח אייאר תעד לפק (1714).
שלו (ם) רב לאה' (בי) מחותני אי"א⁵, א"ב, ב"ב⁶ חשוב ויקר והנעלה כהר"ר
אהרן יצ"ו. ר"ד. י"א.
שנית בין אייך מודיע פון אונזן גזונד, דעזגלייכן זאלין מיר הערן פון אייך לא"א⁷.
שוב אהובי מחותני איז מיר גרוש חידוש, דז איר מיר קיין תשובה האט גשדיבן
אוב איר דיא זאכן פר הנדלט⁸ האט, דיא איך מכ"ת גשיקט האב אויף דיא פאשט,
אונ' וויא איר דער מיט גהנדלט האט. מי יתן, אז איר העט פיל געלט דער מיט
פר דינט. ע"כ ווערט מכ"ת גבעטן אונ' מיר שרייבן מיט ערשטי גלענהייט.

¹ Western Yidd. *mémele*, also aunt.

² To supplement: פאסט.

³ Comp. No. 6, note 25.

⁴ Misspelling: כ"ח אייר.

⁵ איש ירא אלהים.

⁶ בעל בית.

⁷ לאורך ימים, אמן.

⁸ From Dutch "verhandeld" = sold.

פרלגנט מיך דער נאך אונ' וויא מיין בלימכה¹ פארט², בייא וועם זיא נון איז אונ' אוב זיא וואז פראשפרירט³. מכ"ת ווערט מוחל זיין אונ' איר זאגן, דז זיא איר געלט צו ראט האלט⁴ אונ' זאל אויף איין תכלית גדענקן. זיא ווערט דאך ניט אייביג דיגן.

אונ' דר מיט גוט יום טוב⁵ ושמחת בחגך. ממני מחותנך יהודא בר יצחק כץ וצ"ל. גריסט מיינט וועגן רייכלה שתי' וגם חותנו (The word is unreadable) ידידי' (ה) אונ' מינדלה וכב"ב. גסיתנו ר' שמשון אונ' לאה וכב"ב.

לק"ק לונדו

ליד אהובי' מחותני היקר והנעלה כהר"ר אהרן יצ"ו.

נאסר לורים בחדר"ג.

מק"ק אמשטדם⁷.

J. MAITLIS.

London.

¹ Comp. No. 2.

² How Blimche fares.

³ If she prospers.

⁴ To take proper care of her money.

⁵ The letter was written on the 28th Iyar, shortly before the festival of Shavuot.

⁶ וכל בני ביתו.

⁷ Misspelling: אמשטדס.

ERRATA

To the first part of this article in Vol. VI, No. 3:

p. 157, note 6: read C. Roth, *The Great Synagogue*, p. 29.

Ibid., note 7: read *ibid.*, p. 30.

p. 159, line 25: for אנר שט read אנורשט.

p. 160, line 2: for לכא read לכאן.

p. 162, line 19: for *Dezen* read *Dehen*.

Ibid., line 29: for כסלו read מקץ.

Ibid., line 30: for יתרו שבט read יתרו.

CURRENT LITERATURE

THEOLOGIE ALS GLAUBENSWAGNIS.
Festschrift für Karl Heim zum
80. Geburtstag Dargebracht von
der Evang.-Theol. Fakultät in
Tübingen. Im Furcht-Verlag/
Hamburg.

Karl Heim is one of the great figures in twentieth-century Protestant Theology in Germany and well known also in this country. The present volume presented to him as a "Festschrift" on the occasion of his 80th birthday is a fitting tribute to this outstanding theologian and philosopher. It contains a number of essays and studies of interest to Jewish as well as Christian scholars.

K. Elliger discusses the Biblical formula "I am the Lord your God" in comparison with the shorter phrase "I am the Lord," a subject dealt with previously by W. Zimmerli (Alt-Festschrift, 1953) in an article reaching more or less the same result. Elliger sees in the longer formula a "Heilsgeschichts- oder Huldformel," in the other a "Heilighkeits- oder Hoheitsformel." The one represents the God of promise and of "Heilsgeschichte," the other the holy God who avenges disobedience and presents a more terrifying aspect. This characterization is derived from Lev. xviii, but does not really fit all the relevant passages, and the author is therefore compelled to admit that the oldest strata of Biblical literature use the two formulæ rather indiscriminately. It should be of interest that a passage in the *Mekhilta* (8a) interprets the shorter formula in the sense advocated by Elliger. (See A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, I, 1927, p. 45.) This reflects the early Rabbinic (and Philonic) interpretation of the *Tetragrammaton* as denoting the quality of Justice. In the *Sifra* on Lev. xviii, 2, 5, the (later) standard interpretation of

the *Tetragrammaton* as signifying the attribute of Mercy in contrast to the name *Elohim* denoting Justice, colours already the exegesis of the two formulæ. As a result, the short formula now becomes a "Huldformel," and the longer a both promising and threatening one. Elliger might have considered the connotations of the Divine Names in connection with his problem.

Arthur Weise deals in an illuminating way with the short and enigmatic chapter 45 in Jeremiah which is addressed to Baruch.

E. Wurthwein applies the method of "Gattungsgeschichte" to an elucidation of Isaiah's much-discussed message to King Ahas (vii, 1-9). What is the meaning of his counsel of quietude (*hashqet*)? Is it inactivity (Gressmann) or a sense of trust not excluding action (Elliger)? W. suggests that the prophecy belongs to the *genus* of "addresses in war-time" of which we have many instances in the Bible, such as Dt. xx, Jos. viii, 1, etc. It means to instil both courage and trust. Isaiah wanted to defeat Ahas's plan of entering into a coalition with Assyria, which would have entailed recognition of the god Shamash. Moreover, God's covenant with the House of David was a reality as long as one had faith in it. Faith as understood here is not a general attitude of belief but an act of trust in the covenant and in the truth of the old traditions. It has its exact meaning in the concrete elements of the situation. Wurthwein gives his study the sub-title "Ein Beitrag zu dem Thema: Prophetie und Politik." No reference occurs to Martin Buber's treatment of the Isaiah passage under the same aspect.

Of great interest are a number of essays in the section "Systematic Theology." Rudolf Paulus reviews the conceptions of

Time in modern physics, biology, philosophy of history, and in Heidegger. He presses forward beyond these notions toward a time fulfilled in eternity. His standpoint is akin to the views held by C. Fr. v. Weizsaecker, K. Heim, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, and Franz Rosenzweig, all of whom, except Rosenzweig, are referred to.

A background of religious existentialism informs also H. Thielicke's sympathetic treatment of the problem of truth confronting a doctor who knows his patient is doomed. Shall he tell him the truth? The author sees the problem not as one of psychological technique or of factual information but as one of the personal maturity of the doctor as a human being. This essay will be read with profit by doctors as well as ministers of religion.

Of deep spiritual interest is also G. Rosenkranz's comparative study of the theme of the lost son in the Lotus-Sūtra written by an unknown author at about 200 C.E. (translated into English by H. Kern in "The Sacred Books of the East" series, Vol. XXI, 1884; see chap. 4) and Luke xv, 11ff.

A.A.

מלון הכתיב העברי בשיטת תעתיק

(Hebrew spelling dictionary, transcription method, prepared by a group of teachers). Pocket size, 201 pp. Published by Kiriat Sefer, Jerusalem, 5712.

An aid of this kind has been long overdue. The dictionary gives the Hebrew words in a romanized transliteration and in the order of the Latin alphabet. Opposite each transliterated form appears the word in vocalized Hebrew characters, with indication of gender in case of nouns. Words differently spelt but pronounced the same (homophones) are provided with short explanations; otherwise meanings are not indicated. There is a very brief grammatical introduction, and a supplement giving the spelling of place-names.

The system of transliteration is clearly set out on the front and back fly-leaves for easy reference. It is designed so as to represent each Hebrew sound by one Roman sign. Some of the signs chosen may be strange to the "Anglo-Saxon": *h* for *ח* and *כ*; *j* for *י*; *c* for *צ*; overlined *s* for *ש* (*sh*); *ē* for the vowel *Tzere*. However, one will quickly get used to these. It is, of course, essential that such a transcription should unequivocally represent current pronunciation, as otherwise words cannot be readily found. The authors have reproduced the *Tzabra* pronunciation by not distinguishing any sounds not differentiated by the Israeli speaker,* and by not indicating *Aleph* and *ʿAyin* except immediately after a consonant (*k'ev*, *m'od*). They ignore the distinction between *Shewa nach* and *Shewa naʿ*. In this respect, however, they have gone too far, for they omit the *Shewa* also in those cases where it is pronounced, e.g. in *lhitraot*, *jfēfija* (יִפְהִיָּה) which the naïve speaker would probably look for under *lehitraot*, *jefefija*. The combination *-aʿ-* is not distinguished from *-a^{ca}-*: thus *taatik* "transliteration," though spelt *taʿtiq*; this is a concession to common usage, but then it would also have been better to transcribe *הַכְחִיֵּשׁ* as *hikhiš* rather than *hikhiš*, and to write *kupai* and not *kupaj* for קופאי "cashier."

The intention, to give the words commonly used in present-day Hebrew, has on the whole been effectively carried out, and the little work might, if provided with English equivalents, serve as a useful dictionary of current Hebrew. It is remarkably well bound and printed.

C. RABIN.

* It should be noted, however, that a "Sephardi" style of pronunciation, distinguishing at least *Aleph* and *ʿAyin*, is increasingly establishing itself among speakers of "Oriental" origin even in the second and third generation.

J. PINKERFELD. *The Synagogues of Italy*. Mosad Bialik, Jerusalem, 1954.

This publication is a labour of love by an architect. It provides a survey and chronology of Italian synagogues, assessments of their style, and a number of good photographs and elaborate and exact drawings.

An architect can hardly be expected to do the work of an historian, and so this study too reflects, as so many others, the lamentable lack of co-operation between those who venture into the field of Jewish studies in matters artistic. Valuable though this publication is, it could have been much improved by collaboration with historians and art historians. But it was high time that someone drew attention to the synagogue tradition in Italy, and Pinkerfeld's slim volume serves its purpose well by classifying the Italian synagogues according to type and within their environment and, above all, by providing an exact and suggestive pictorial record.

HELEN ROSENAU.

P. AUVRAY, *Initiation à l'Hébreu Biblique*. 269 pp. Desclée & Cie, Tournay (Belgique), 1955. Price ca. £2 10s.

This book is designed on an original plan which makes it a very suitable tool for those studying without a teacher. First, a rapid and concentrated, yet remarkably full sketch of grammar, including some syntax; this is followed by very detailed explanations to four Biblical passages, two prose and two verse, 86 verses in all: the texts are printed a word to a line, literally translated, the forms explained, and on the opposite page other words from the same root, textual remarks, references to Hebraisms in the Latin and Greek versions, and other helps towards enlarging and deepening the learner's knowledge are provided. Finally ca. 1,500 words—all those

occurring 10 times or more in the Bible—are given in sense groups, e.g., "family," "life and death," "travelling," "religion." These vocabularies are again accompanied by discursive remarks, and occasionally by little exercises, as, e.g., Isa. xi, 6-8 for "animals."

Altogether a bright book, in which advantage has been taken of every pedagogical device the author could lay hands on. The layout, print, and paper are all excellent. The grammatical analysis is, on the whole, up to date; only in the matter of etymologies recent results of scholarship are sometimes ignored. It seems to the present reviewer that the material for "lecture expliquée" could with advantage have been doubled in quantity; as far as the English learner is concerned, the best thing would probably be to follow up with Spurrell's Notes on Genesis, Driver's Notes on Samuel, and Burney's Notes on Kings.

C. RABIN.

DAVID AND TAMAR DE SOLA POOL. *An Old Faith in a New World. Portrait of Shearith Israel 1654-1954*. Columbia University Press, 1955. 120s. net.

After his *Portraits Etched in Stone* which told the history of the early Jewish settlers in New York City, Dr. Pool has now produced, in co-operation with Mrs. Pool, this superb 595-page volume which describes in sixteen monumental chapters the history of the Sephardi Congregation "Shearith Israel" of New York. No more dignified tribute could have been paid to this ancient and illustrious community on the occasion of the American-Jewish Tercentenary. A large number of excellent photographs lend colour to the text, and apart from interesting appendices there are notes, a glossary, a rich bibliography and indices. The book is produced with a lavishness which makes us feel a trifle backward in our more austere Anglo-Jewish way of book production.

A.A.

SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY

Among recent public lectures given under the auspices of the Society have been the following:

Dr. CHAIM RABIN, Lecturer in Post-Biblical Hebrew in the University of Oxford: "The Problem of Mishnaic Hebrew."

Dr. ABRAM SPIRO: "Polemicists and Doctrinaires Rewrite Biblical History."

Mr. D. J. WISEMAN, O.B.E., M.A., of the British Museum: "New Babylonian Evidence of the Capture of Jerusalem (597 B.C.E.)."

The following course of lectures on "An Introduction to Jewish Law," for members of the Cambridge University Jewish Society, was sponsored by the Society for Jewish Study during the Lent Term, 1956: "The Sources and Authorities—Torah, Mishnah, Gemarah," by Rabbi Dr. LOUIS JACOBS; "History and Authority of Responsa" (from the standpoint of Comparative Law), by BERTRAM B. BENAS; "The Law of Marriage and Divorce," by Dr. GEORGE J. WEBBER.

A reception was given on April 10, 1956, in honour of Rabbi Dr. A. LOEWENSTAMM, on his retirement from the office of Director of Studies. On behalf of the large assembly of his colleagues, pupils, and friends, tributes were paid by Rabbi Dr. LEO BAECK, Dr. E. J. COHN, Rabbi Dr. H. REINHART, Rabbi C. BERG, and Dr. L. ZEITLIN. Warm appreciation was expressed of his devoted services during the past decade to the weekly seminar, study courses, public lectures, and other activities of the Society. Acknowledging a presentation of books, Dr. LOEWENSTAMM spoke of the traditions of Jewish learning and scholarly research which the Society fostered.

HUGH HARRIS, *Hon. Secretary.*

Hillel House, London, W.C.1.

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES, MANCHESTER

"Stenecourt," Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs.

The following Papers were read at the Institute's Research Seminars during the Spring Term, 1956:

Mr. J. G. WEISS, M.A., on "R. Hayyim of Amduras' Theology of Contemplation."

Dr. C. RABIN (Oxford) on "The Language of the Medieval Hebrew Translations."

Dr. S. VAN DEN BERGH (London) on "The Love of God in Ghazali's *Vivication of Theology*."

Mr. S. LAUER on "The Concept of *Hak* in Islamic and Jewish Philosophy."

Dr. C. BEN SASSON (Jerusalem-Oxford) on "The Conception of *Galut* in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries."

Rabbi Dr. A. ALTMANN on "Theology in Twentieth-Century German Jewry."

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

INDEX TO VOLUME VI

1955

	PAGE
BOWMAN, JOHN, Early Samaritan Eschatology	63
ITALIENER, the late Dr. B., Which is the Oldest Woodcut Haggadah? ..	227
KESTENBERG GLADSTEIN, RUTH. Differences of Estates Within Pre- Emancipation Jewry	35
LAUER, S. Eusebes Logismos in <i>IV Macc.</i>	170
LEHMANN, O. H., Gleanings from Oxford Manuscripts (I)	100
MAITLIS, J., London Yiddish Letters of the early Eighteenth Century (I)	153
———— (II)	237
RABIN, C. On a Puzzling Passage in the Damascus Fragments	53
———— A Reply	111
———— Judges V, 2 and the "Ideology" of Deborah's War	125
RABINOWICZ, H. Rabbi Colon and Messer-Leon	166
RUBINSTEIN, ARIE. The Appellation "Galileans" in Ben Kosebha's Letter to Ben Galgola	26
———— The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll	187
SARNA, NAHUM M. Some Instances of the Enclitic-m in Job	108
STERN, S. M. Rationalists and Kabbalists in Medieval Allegory	73
———— Isaac Israeli's <i>Book of Substances</i>	135
TEICHER, J. L. The Mediaeval Mind	1
———— On a Puzzling Passage in the Damascus Fragments	53
TISHBY, I. Gnostic Doctrines in Sixteenth-Century Jewish Mysticism ..	146
VAJDA, GEORGES. The Mystical Doctrine of Rabbi 'Obadyah, Grandson of Moses Maimonides	213
WELLS, J. G. R. Abraham Kalisker's Concept of Communion with God and Men	87
WERBLOWSKY, R. J. ZWI. A Note on the Text of Seder Eliyahu	201
WIEDER, N. The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs among the Karaites	14
WINTON THOMAS, D. Some Remarks on the Hebrew Root ידע	50

REVIEWS

Australian Biblical Review, Vol. III (D. Winton Thomas)	56
AUVRAY, P. Initiation à l'Hébreu Biblique, Tournay, 1955 (C. Rabin) ..	255
BEER, G. Hebräische Grammatik, revised by R. Meyer (C. Rabin)	116
DE SOLA POOL, DAVID and TAMAR, An Old Faith in a New World, 1955 (A.A.)	255
DOEVE, J. W. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, 1954 (Z.W.)	122
FESTSCHRIFT ALBRECHT ALT, Leipzig, 1953-4 (Z.W.)	120
FREDMAN, M. (ed.). A Minority in Britain, London (N. Laski)	118
GINSBERG, C. D. The Essenes and the Kabbalah, London, 1955 (Z.W.)	120
GOTTSTEIN, M., Z. LIVNEH, S. SPAHN, הדקדוק העברי השמושי (C. Rabin)	118
HYAMSON, ALBERT M. <i>Jews' College</i> , London, 1955 (R. Loewe)	183
KURZWEIL, BARUCH. מסכת הרומאן, Jerusalem, 1953 (C. Rabin)	117
LEVENE ABRAHAM. The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis, London, 1951 (C. Moss)	58
LIPMAN, V. D. Social History of the Jews in England 1850-1950, London (A. Saltman)	184

MIDRASHIC SELECTIONS, Introduction and Notes by P. R. Weis, Leiden, 1955 (C. Rabin)	116
MURRAY, MARGARET. The Divine King in England, London (Z.W.)	121
PARROT, A. Le Temple de Jérusalem, Neuchatel and Paris, 1954 (B. S. J. Isserlin)	184
PINKERFELD, J. The Synagogues of Italy, Jerusalem, 1954 (H. Rosenau)	255
SCHONFELD, S. The Universal Bible, London, 1955 (Z.W.)	182
SCHWARZENBACH, A. Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des Alten Testaments, Leiden, 1954 (B. S. J. Isserlin)	184
THEOLOGIE ALS GLAUBENSWAGNIS. Festschrift für Karl Heim, Hamburg (A.A.)	253
To Do and To Teach: Essays in Honour of Charles Lynn Pyatt, Lexington, 1953 (Z.W.)	183
מלון הכתיב העברי בשיטת תעתיק (Hebrew Spelling Dictionary, transcription Method, Prepared by a Group of Teachers) Jerusalem, 5712 (Rabin)	254

JOURNAL OF SEMITIC STUDIES

Edited by
H. H. ROWLEY and P. R. WEIS

The field of study of this new quarterly is a broad one, and the editors hope to include articles of linguistic, literary, historical, archæological, and cultural interest. Jewish studies are especially represented, covering the whole period of Israel's history, save that current affairs are not included. Outstanding scholars in Old Testament, Jewish, Arabic, and Accadian studies have written articles for the early issues. The first number contains articles on Old Testament and Islamic subjects, and book reviews.

Annual subscription 32s. post free, or 10s. 6d. each issue

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

SECRETS OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Studies Towards Their Solution

by Hugh J. Schonfield

Editor and Translator of *The Authentic New Testament*

The aim of Dr. Schonfield's book is to discover as far as possible the true historical associations of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The author, feeling that to form a sound judgment a great deal more external information is required, has sought for such material in many out-of-the-way places of Jewish literature, legend, and tradition. Some of this material has not previously been applied to the problem of the Scrolls and is very revealing, particularly on the evolution of the Messianic idea.

21/- net

VALLENTINE, MITCHELL

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

CONTRIBUTIONS

MSS. should be sent to the Editor, c/o The Institute of Jewish Studies, Stenecourt, Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs. They should, if possible, be *neatly typed, in double spacing, with a generous margin, on one side of the paper only*. There are about 450 words to each printed page. Any Hebrew used should be either typed, written in square characters, or transliterated. No fee is offered; but contributors of articles will be sent one complimentary copy of the issue in which their article appears together with twenty-five offprints of the article itself. Further offprints may be purchased provided the Editor is informed when the manuscript is submitted to him. Contributors of book reviews will be sent a copy of the Journal. Offprints of reviews may be purchased from the Publishers.

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

Contributors are requested to adhere to the following conventions

(a) In articles on history, literature, etc., use only the vowel signs *a, e* (for *Šere, Segol, and Shewa*), *i, o, u*, without diacritic marks. Do not distinguish with *d* and *g* between *dagesh* and *rafe*, write *b* and *v*, *k* and *kh*, *p* and *f*, *t* and *th*. Indicate *dagesh forte* by doubling. Express final ה by *h*. Special letters: א ' (where pronounced), ו *w*, ז *z*, ח *h*, ט *t*, צ *c*, ש *s*, ק *q*, ש *sh*, ש *s* (=ס).

Names etc. for which there is an established English spelling, should of course be written as usual, e.g. *Jacob, Jerusalem, Kabbala*.

(b) In philological articles only, where an exact transliteration is required, use the following system:

Vowels: *ā, ē, ǝ* (*Segol-yod*), *ī, ō, ū*; *a, æ, i, o* (*Qamaṣ qatan*), *u*; *a, æ, o, e* (*Shewa*).

Consonants with *Rafe*: *b, g, d, k, p, t*.

Special letters (other than for system [a]): ש *ś*, ש *ś*.

If desired, write ' (*Alef*) initial and final.

TRANSLITERATION OF ARABIC

Please follow the system of the Royal Asiatic Society, but without underlining the digraphs *th, kh, dh, sh*.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISEMENTS

All communications regarding subscriptions and advertisements should be addressed to the Publishers, JEWISH CHRONICLE PUBLICATIONS, 37 Furnival Street, London, E.C.4, England, who will be glad to send quotations to contributors desiring additional offprints. Binders for Volumes I to V are available at 2s. 6d. each.

PRICE

5s. 6d. (\$0.90) per copy

21s. (\$3.50) per annum

DATE DUE

MAY 20 1994	
MAY 9 1994	
MAY 5 1997	
MAY 9 1997	
MAY 27 1997	
MAY 30 1997	
NOV 22 1997	
DEC 2 1997	
DEC 9 1997	
DEC 9 1997	
JAN 8 1998	
JAN 20 1998	
AUG 16 1998	
GAYLORD	PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
 2400 Ridge Road
 Berkeley, CA 94709
 For renewals call (510) 649-2500
 All items are subject to recall.